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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

C 第二步
请确认将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之主。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三步
请把票证之选择针，由小孔垂直插入打孔投票。

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

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

E 第四步
投票选票之后，把选票取出，放入至封条内，票尾凸在外。

在封条上，有字自须填入为投票人应用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN &quot;GOLF&quot; TREVINO</td>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattlemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNNY GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senator Majority Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEGENBERG</td>
<td>Chiropractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Lieutenant Governor

**Vicegobernador**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL WATKINS</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Secretary of State

**Secretario de Estado**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALICE KEYSER</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH R. SMITH</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN HOWARD</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Democratic Party**

*Election Primaria 8 de Junio de 1982*

---

**State Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tuenti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tuenti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tuenti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Tuenti**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTROLLER

IRA CLARK
Businessman-Educator
Comerciante-Educador  57

KENNETH CORY
California State Controller
Contralor del Estado de California  59

Treasurer
JESSE M. UNRUH
State Treasurer
Tesorero Estatal  65

Attorney General
OMER L. RAINS
Senator/Prosecuting Attorney
Senador/Abogado Fiscal  71

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
District Attorney, Los Angeles County
Procurador del Distrito del Condado de Los Ángeles  73
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td>Public Accountant / Contador Publico</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</td>
<td>Public Affairs Counselor / Consejero de Asuntos Publicos</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN KOPP</td>
<td>County Supervisor / Lawyer / Supervisor del Condado / Abogado</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>Consultant / Consultor</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE SCOTT</td>
<td>Board Certified Appraiser / Tasador-Valuador Certificado del Consejo</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>Board Equalization Deputy / Diputado, Consejo de Igualamiento</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN CHURCH</td>
<td>Retired County Supervisor / Jubilado Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>U.S. Senator’s Deputy / Diputado de Congresistas de los E.U.A</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOBERNADOR DE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. BUCHANAN</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRATISTA GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM METZGER</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRABADOR ESTADOUNIDENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MORGAN</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Busing Advocate/Clergyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPONENTE CONTRA EL TRANSPORTE DE ALUMNOS POR MEDIO DE AUTOBUSES/CÓRREGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator, State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senador, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPLETTE</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Machinist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAQUINISTA GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTUDIANTE CONSTITUCIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL K. WHITEHURST</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Fresno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCALDE DE FRESNO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. WERTZ JR.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTOR POLITICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORE VIDAL</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HAMPTON</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRADOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative in Congress — 5th District
Diputado al Congreso — Distrito #5

PHILLIP BURTON
Member of the United States Congress
Miembro del Congreso Estadounidense

Vote for One
Vote por Uno

Member of the Assembly — 19th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito # 19

LOUIS J. PAPAN
Member of the Assembly
Miembro de la Asamblea

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARLO SMITH</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANN HENDRICKS</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN LANTZ</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVELYN K. LANTZ</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT L. BURTON</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN E. KILBER</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN KELLY KENNEDY</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT D. INGRAHAM</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN TWOMEY</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9
Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td>Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Superintendent of Public Instruction
Superintendente de Instrucción Publica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td>Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td>School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td>Principal/Directora</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td>Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Memebre, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessor
Asesor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Defender
Defensor Público

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>For 212, Against 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>President of Senate. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>Yes 215, No 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Taxation. Real Property Valuation. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>Yes 219, No 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bail. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>Yes 223, No 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>Yes 228, No 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>Yes 232, No 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

212 A FAVOR FAVOR

ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Dispone emisión de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

213 EN CONTRA CONTRA


215 SI SI

PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicegerente sea Presidente del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ningúin impacto directo estatal o local.

216 NO NO


219 SI SI

FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALUACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Elimina la definición de "cambio de tenencia" para evitar exenciones de propiedad tomada por procedimientos de tipo daño ambiental. Impacto fiscal: Significativa pérdida de réditos del Impuesto a la Propiedad y aumentos en los costos administrativos para gobernar locales. Insuficiente en el estado federal pero proporciona existencia compensativa a los distritos escolares locales y de colegios de la comunidad. Aumento en los réditos estatales del Impuesto a la renta debido a deducciones más bajas del Impuesto a la Propiedad.

220 NO NO


223 SI SI

FINANZA. Prohibe dar libertad bajo fianza cuando la corte tiene noticia de que la persona no puede cumplir con las condiciones de fianza.

224 NO NO


228 SI SI


229 NO NO


232 SI SI


233 NO NO
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.
REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.


JUSTICIA PENAL. Emendando la Constitución y promueve estatutos con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y liberaciones de personas acusadas y condenadas y en la que concierne a los víctimas. Impacto fiscal: Costos estatales y locales mayores que no pueden ser previstos con ningún grado de certeza.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, una ley que destine instalaciones de suministro de agua adicionales al Proyecto del Valle Central. Impacto fiscal: Bajo los termas previstos, no se registra aumento en los impuestos estatales; reducción en los reditos estatales resultaría en reducciones correspondientes en las pagas estatales a las gobiernos y escuelas locales.

REESTRUCTURACIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981 que revisa los límites de los 52 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si es aprobado, ningún costo adicional a local. Si es rechazado, costos al estado de $250,000 y a los condados de $50,000.

REESTRUCTURACIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981 que revisa los límites de los 40 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si es aprobado, ningún costo adicional a local. Si es rechazado, costos al estado de $370,000 y a los condados de $600,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opción 1</th>
<th>Opción 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sujetos impuestos en recaudar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que haga a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decide o especial por medio del correo?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberán la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sea una contribución promedio de los diez mejores del estado que tengan la población más grande?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los cuadros sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados del sistema de Servicio de Salud?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Debería permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un empleado del sistema de jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión el casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuación y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el motivo del actuar llevado a cabo por lo menos cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los diarios de pensiones para inversiones sujetas a los poderes de revisión del Controller?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Texto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar sujeto al control del Servicio Civil y permitirá a dicha Administración designar un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo al amparo del administrador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al amparo del miembro.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá el supervisor que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisores de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta a partir del 8 de enero de 1983 y cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibió la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de supervisores electos deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Declaración de Política: Deberá la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir un computador para las oficinas para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Declaración de Política: Se ordenará que el gobernador de San Francisco a las recientes alzas de precios de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico, recomendará enfáticamente que la Comisión Estatal de Servicios Públicos reduzca los precios a cuyo extremo estaban el 1° de diciembre de 1981 y además podrá otros remedios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes. The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
   • State Assemblyman
   • United States Congressman
   • United States Senator
   • State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
   • Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
   • and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
   • three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
   • two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
   • two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party’s candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril J. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Yavuris, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Louis, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shoresteen, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Ruddien, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P.S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Cohenitz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Famatin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Monkowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Young Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlosta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Deputy, Rent Control Board
Majette J. Jackson, 324 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andreia J. Jeson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Tampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Manucci, 320 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Sonic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nuccio, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Ooni, 300 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 3863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3231 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wofford, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinosa, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

• Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
• Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
• Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gynant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Farnan and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalia Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Shindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST
My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI
My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco's charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition "A", use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "A" means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "A".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Proposition "A" is designed to save money for the City. "A" involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition "A" does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City's cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition "A" would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition "A" is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous "rip off" of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress "wises up" and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may grant and build the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle uncumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (herein) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be issued and shall be sold by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per cent per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued; and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first money received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable, the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding, such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness))

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000. annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco's charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition "A", use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "A" means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "A".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Proposition "A" is designed to save money for the City. "A" involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition "A" does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City's cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition "A" would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition "A" is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous "rip off" of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress "wises up" and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

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

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

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((hereinabove)) hereinafter authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year 28 in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the highest net price for the purchase, provided the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which such money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
PROPPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct
by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco's taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote “No” on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board “may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election.”

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote “No” on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based “Committee for Economic Democracy” will likely suggest that we vote by telephone “call in” next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller's Statement on “C”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy workforce is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City’s contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “D”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category "Surviving Spouse" and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Farichan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E

Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on “E”

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

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE

Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dobson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and
County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

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


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition “F” is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition “F” will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition “F” will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition “F” is a “no-cost,” Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
              Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
              Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
              Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
              Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is “deposited” with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by:  Supervisor John L. Molinari  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco  
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. *(end)*
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in California have a retiree representative on boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hon
Supervisor Nancy G. Walek

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?

That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The day-to-day administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and leaves the Secretary-General Manager in charge of ranks of Civil Service, the very service he's trying to manage for retirement purposes. Further, it puts politics into the system by allowing another appointee.

Let's not add more weight to an already bloated government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

Committee for a Sound Retirement Board
James

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco, la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City’s costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION  
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

(end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisrial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisrial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisrial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller's Statement on "L"

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Bayliss
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Marlene McInerny, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Ort
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinneny, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202. President and Committees of the Board

((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisiorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin I. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time.”

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
P.G. & E. Rates

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don’t want to pay for PG&E’s bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let’s be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG&E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E’s purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other officer or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

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

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, ((exclusive of dental or optical care)) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.423, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors (t), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herebefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition herebefore submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System (.), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) **nine** members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) **three** members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) **two** of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((,) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.))) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((,)))

is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)
The REPUBLICAN PARTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Invites you to participate in the
process of Good Government

You can participate in good government by becoming a Sustaining Member of the REPUBLICAN Party. Dues are $10 per year. You will receive a membership card, our quarterly Newsletter, and notice of upcoming events in this exciting election year.

You can help in a variety of ways that will best utilize your important skills. You can participate in our precinct organization, voter registration, and election get-out-the-vote activities. You may explore the critical issues which face San Francisco now and in the future.

Please complete the coupon below and mail it. Why not do it today?

Cordially,
M. Lester O'Shea, Chairman
Republican County Committee

Please mail to:
Republican Party of San Francisco
625 Market Street, Suite 211
San Francisco, California 94105

☐ Enclosed is my check in the amount of $____________ for a Sustaining Membership
☐ Please send me information on how I can become involved in the Republican Party

Name_________________________________________ Day Phone____________________

Address_________________________________________ Zip____________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT

APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETRAS DE IMPRENTA Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
正楷書寫姓名
Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE __JUNE 8, 1982__
I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

Por la presente solicito una balota de Volante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIÉME LA BALOTA A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Date/FECHA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

5. I prefer election materials in English
Prefero materiales electorales en español

6. □ I prefer election materials in English
□ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
□ 我欲索取中文選舉資料

如果已遷居

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.
I moved on ________19__. My residence address is ___________ Zip Code ________.

NOTE: A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

NOTE: Un votante que se cambie dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambia antes de los 29 días anteriores de la elección y que no se registra antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.
Me cambio el ________ de 19__.
Mi dirección es ___________ Area Postal ________.

6. □ I prefer election materials in English
□ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
□ 我欲索取中文選舉資料

如果已遷居，現所居住地址不是你在

Beginning of Registration

BEGINNING OF REGISTRATION

MAIL TO:
ENVIAR A:

| APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN |
| REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 6:00 P.M. |
| TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982 |
| 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY. |

ABSSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO |
DE LA TARDE, MARTES 4, JUNIO |
EL SEGUNDO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA |
ELECCION.

申请缺席选票必须在选举日七日之前，
即6月1日，星期二下午五时前递交至

Registration Office or Receipted to this application.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

(continued on the back)
Voter Selection Coupon

Application for absentee ballot appearances on Page 63

Application para papelera de votante ausente aparece en la Página 63
San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet

Primary Election June 8, 1982
Sample Ballot Page 4

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#—Area EAST of (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#3—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

Jay Patterson Registrar of Voters
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GENERAL INFORMATION
Your Rights As a Voter ............... 20
Words You Need to Know .......... 22
Absentee Ballot Application ....... 63
Location of Your Polling Place .... 64
Voter Selection Coupon ............ 64
Voting Instructions ................. 3
SAMPLE BALLOT .................. 5

CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE
Richard E. Best .................. 23
Alfred G. Chiantelli ............... 23
Patricia (Pat) Lucey .............. 24
Richard Tullis ................... 24

CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER
Jeff Brown ....................... 25

CANDIDATES FOR ASSESSOR
Sam Duca ........................... 25

PROPOSITIONS
PROPOSITION A
Removes some of the restrictions in issuance of tax anticipation notes.
Analysis .................. 26
Arguments ................. 27
Text of proposed law .... 28, 57

PROPOSITION B
Allows Supervisors the option of conducting a local election by mail.
Analysis .................. 29
Arguments ................. 30, 31
Text of proposed law .... 57

PROPOSITION C
Establishes a dental plan for City employees.
Analysis .................. 32
Argument .................. 33
Text of proposed law .... 57, 58

PROPOSITION D
Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
Analysis .................. 34
Argument .................. 35
Text of proposed law .... 58, 59

PROPOSITION E
Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.
Analysis .................. 36
Argument .................. 37
Text of proposed law .... 60

PROPOSITION F
Establishes procedural and bookkeeping changes in the City's retirement system.
Analysis .................. 38
Argument .................. 39
Text of proposed law .... 60

PROPOSITION G
Gives the Retirement Board exclusive jurisdiction over investment of pension funds.
Analysis .................. 40
Argument .................. 41
Text of proposed law .... 41

PROPOSITION H
Changes the composition of the Health Service Board.
Analysis .................. 42
Argument .................. 43
Text of proposed law .... 60, 61

PROPOSITION I
Changes the composition of the Retirement Board and removes Manager from Civil Service.
Analysis .................. 44
Argument .................. 45
Text of proposed law .... 61

PROPOSITION J
Two Retirement System administrators to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
Analysis .................. 46
Argument .................. 47
Text of proposed law .... 47

PROPOSITION K
Supervisors' legislative aids to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
Analysis .................. 48
Argument .................. 49
Text of proposed law .... 49

PROPOSITION L
Board Presidency would go to supervisory candidate who received the most votes.
Analysis .................. 50
Arguments ................. 51, 52
Text of proposed law .... 52

PROPOSITION M
Declares it to be City policy to purchase a fingerprint computer.
Analysis .................. 53
Arguments .................. 54

PROPOSITION N
Declares opposition to recent PG&E rate increases.
Analysis .................. 55
Arguments .................. 56
Text of proposed declaration . 56

CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this pamphlet were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the committee are Judith Anderson (Chair), Nancy Yoshihara Mayeda, Cecile Michael, Jane Morrison and Dick Robertson. Chief Deputy City Attorney Thomas Toomey serves on the committee as legal advisor.

The map of the new districts on the cover was done by Lorraine Perkins.

The printer was Gazette Press, Inc.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

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

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

**B 第一步**

请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

**C 第二步**

請切記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

**D 第三步**

請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

**STEP 4**

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

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

**E 第四步**

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected. To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided, for that purpose on the Write-in Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void. If you wrongfully punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-in Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hay dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidarán el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precincto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票記名卡上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

選民在所選擇的任何候選人名稱之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上競選所得之所有候選人中，選中您所要候選人的候選人打孔，但不要超過選選的候選人數。

選民必須在候選人適用的選票上，請在候選人選票所附的選票空白處選出下數候選人所要選的職位和候選人的姓名。

選民在所選票中，請在選票上競選所得 "YES" 或 "NO" 手標打孔。

選票上若有顯著污點或被塗抹，選票則作廢。

如果在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄壞了，或撕破了非候選候選人的選票信封，應將該選票送還給選舉的投票處，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

 PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>William H.R. “Bill” Clark</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George “Duke” Deukmejian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Arthur (Mike) Hirt</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James C. Mansfield</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Gov.</td>
<td>Mike Curb</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of S.</td>
<td>Marz Garcia</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Hallett</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of S.</td>
<td>Glenn Rose</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob “Jay” Margosian</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Duffy</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Republican Party | Vote for One
|------------------|------------------|
| Treasurer        | Vote por Uno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAMES STIERINGER</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENT LLOYD</td>
<td>Deputy Undersecretary-Education</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegado Subsecretario-Educacion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL KAZANJIAN</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Attorney</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero Corporativo/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>DAVE STIRLING</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member State Board of Equalization - 1st District</td>
<td>LEO BAGDONAS</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H. “BILL” IVERS</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELAINE W. DONALDSON</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLIVER W. WRIGHT</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOE H. ADAMS JR.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Description</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. (BOB) DORNAN</td>
<td>United States Congressman</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY GOLDWATER JR.</td>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>Mayor of San Diego</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN E. REAGAN</td>
<td>Business Executive</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. “JACK” HICKEY</td>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>Behavioral Scientist</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED BRUINSMA</td>
<td>Businessman/Law Dean</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. BOOHER</td>
<td>Microelectronic Engineer</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. “PETE” McCLOSKEY JR.</td>
<td>Member of Congress</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON P. McDANIELS</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN G. SCHMITZ</td>
<td>California State Senator</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM SHOCKLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL “RALPH” D. CORTES</td>
<td>Doctoral Student, UCLA</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress – 5th District</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator – 8th Senatorial District</td>
<td>LEANNE C. GUTH</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly – 17th Assembly District</td>
<td>THOMAS S. CRARY</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEL DAWSON</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID S. SIGAL</td>
<td>State Central Committeeman/Miembro del Comité Central</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mervyn Silberberg</td>
<td>Small Business Advocate/Defensor de Negocios Pequeños</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Stark</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Dawson</td>
<td>Supervisor’s Administrative Assistant/Asistente Administrativo</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Donaldson</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna M. (Mrs. Leland) Guth</td>
<td>Domestic Engineer/Ingeniera Domestica</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland G. Guth</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha M. Gillham</td>
<td>Community Volunteer/Voluntaria de la Comunidad</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Getty</td>
<td>Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly A. Whaley</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Van Heusden</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolf Andrews</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Derek Andrews</td>
<td>Stockbroker/Corredor de Bolsa</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry E. Hughes</td>
<td>Consultant, State Senate/Congressman, Senado Estatal</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie U. Harris</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios Independiente</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Henderson</td>
<td>Small Business Owner/Propietario de Negocio Pequeño</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Henderson</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Payne</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis T. Jackson</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen A. Ernst</td>
<td>Banker/Banquero</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. Terheyden</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Lester O'Shea</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. O'Keefe, Sr.</td>
<td>President, Taxpayers Association/Presidente, Asociación de Contribuyentes</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace A. Myers</td>
<td>Retired Businessman/Hombre de Negocios Jubilado</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B. Moy</td>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith A. Feldman</td>
<td>Public Affairs/Asuntos Publicos</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL Principal/Directora</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Membro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>WILSON RILES State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>BILL HONIG District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>GENE PRAT Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor para Asuntos Educativos</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUDA Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS
STATE PROPOSITIONS

1 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.

FOR 212
AGAINST 213

2 PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.

YES 215
NO 216

3 TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 219
NO 220

4 BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.

YES 223
NO 224

5 GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

YES 228
NO 229

6 GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

YES 232
NO 233
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PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

212 A FAVOR  FAVOR


213 EN CONTRA  CONTRA

215 SI  FAVOR

PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Da voz a la Constitución de que el Vicepresidente sea Presidente del Senado. Impacto local: Ningún impacto directo estatal o local.

216 NO  CONTRA

219 SI  FAVOR

FIJACION DE IMPUESTOS. VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Dirige la delimitación de "campos de bush" para excluir remanentes de propiedad tomada por procedimientos de tierra de manera ilegal. Impacto fiscal: Significativa pérdida de recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en los costos administrativos para gobierno local. Reparto en los costos estatales al proporcionar sustitutos compensatorios a las distritos escolares locales y a colegios de la comunidad. Aumenta en las recaudaciones del impuesto a las ventas, debido a deducciones de impuestos en bajos impuestos a la propiedad. Convención Pa r la libertad bajo fianza cuando la condena tiene consecuencias a la probabilidad de que la persona pueda ser liberada puede causar grandes danos fiscales a otras. Impacto fiscal: Aumento al costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelamiento y sanciones judiciales para fianza. Podrían haber otros compensatorios al la persona que ha más tarde querida la libertad a la prisión.

220 NO  CONTRA

223 SI  FAVOR

FIANZA. Prohibe la liberación bajo fianza cuando la condena tiene consecuencias a la probabilidad de que la persona pueda ser liberada. Impacto fiscal: Aumento al costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelamiento y sanciones judiciales para fianza. Podrían haber otras compensatorias al la persona que ha más tarde querida la libertad a la prisión.

224 NO  CONTRA

228 SI  FAVOR

IMPUESTOS A DONACIONES Y HERENCIA (Propietario Miller). Dirige a que el impuesto estatal "recibir" al cedente hereditario igual al crédito de impuesto federal específico. Impacto fiscal: Reduce la recaudación en unos $130 millones en 1981-83, en unos $305 millones en 1983-84 y en cantidades mayores en 1985 y en adelante. Abarata el pago $5 de millones anuales en costos administrativos. La reducción de las recaudaciones resultaría en reducciones correspondientes en los pagos estatales a los gobiernos locales y a las escuelas.

229 NO  CONTRA

232 SI  FAVOR


233 NO  CONTRA

9F
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.
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三藩市縣地方選
初選 一九八二年六月十八日
所得稅指數調整 制定法案 規定繼續使用物
價指數百分率為調整個人所得稅基礎稅額的基
礎。財政上所受影響，加州稅收在一九八二
年約減少二億三千萬元。一九八三年約少四千五百
億元，以後年年逐漸遞增，加州政府稅收有
於減少，其補助地方政府與學
校的經費亦相應減少。

刑事審判 修改憲法及制定法規，處理訴訟程
序，判決，釋放被誤定罪犯，及有關受商人
事件，財政上的影響，加洲與地方政府所受耗
費重大，難於確定其程度。

水利設備包括外海運河 投“是”票即贊成，
投“否”票即反對。一項法例指示中央流域計
劃增加水利設備，財政上的影響，照目前政策
施工，加州政府須負開支，亦無計劃減加州其
他計劃的耗費。已核准的計劃建議按一九八
年物價計算，會超過三十一億元，但用戶收
費增加，可以彌補。

重新劃分全國參議區 投“是” 票即贊成，投
“否”票即反對，一九八一年制定的法例採用
四十五個全國參議區的界線。財政上的影響，
如預通過，加州與地方政府並無影響。如遭反
對，加州政府須耗費二十五萬元，縣政府耗
費三十五萬元。

重新劃分（加洲）參議區 投“是”票即贊成，
投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會制定
一法令，改訂四十個參議區的界線。財政上的
影響，如預通過，加洲與地方政府並無影
響。如遭反對，加州政府須耗費三十七萬元，
縣政府耗費五十萬元。

重新劃分（加洲）衆議區 投“是”票即贊成，
投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會制定
一法令，改訂八十個衆議區的界線。財政上的
影響，如預通過，加洲與地方政府並無影
響。如遭否決，加州政府耗費四十萬元，縣政府
耗費六十萬。
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PRIMARY ELECTION – JUNE 8, 1982

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

YES 263

NO 264

B Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

YES 267

NO 268

C Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

YES 271

NO 272

D Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?

YES 274

NO 275

E Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

YES 278

NO 279

F Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

YES 281

NO 282

G Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

YES 285

NO 286
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263 SI 贊成

¿Debería la Junta de Supervisiones tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a recabar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal a través del decretó de la Junta de Supervisiones?

264 NO 反對

市議會應否有權借款，依照州法律或市參議會法令發行預期稅收債券？

267 SI 贊成

¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisiones ordenar el Registro de Electores que llave a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decisiva o especial por medio del correo?

268 NO 反對

市議會應否獲准督導選民註冊官以郵寄形式舉行選舉，複選或特別市選？

271 SI 贊成

¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a un plan de salud para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución prudente de los diez años del estudio de los empleados de la ciudad?

272 NO 反對

市政府應否為市職工支付牙醫保健費，保健費額為加州人口均等的十個縣區的平均保健費？

274 SI 贊成

¿Deberán ser subvencionados los fármacos sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

275 NO 反對

市政府應否在相同基礎上分擔在職員工和已退休員工的未亡配偶，一如市政府分擔在保健服務制度內的在職員工和已退休員工？

278 SI 贊成

¿Debería permitir el sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión el cónyuge de nueve años después de los 60 años de edad?

279 NO 反對

退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶，目前可享受補助金，如果他們在六十歲後再婚，應否繼續享受這種補助金？

281 SI 贊成

¿Debería llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuaría y de experticia del sistema de Jubilaciones cuando este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión el cónyuge de nueve años después de los 60 años de edad?

282 NO 反對

退休制度的保全統計和人壽調查，應否每兩年舉行一次，由退休局裁定保全金額和某些費用，由市政府支付？

285 SI 贊成

¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los recursos de pensiones para inversiones sujetas a las pautas de revisión del Contralor?

286 NO 反對

退休局是否具有唯一的權力，以管理退休金用於投資，但須受審計官審核的約束？
H. Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?  

YES 288
NO 289

I. Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?  

YES 292
NO 293

J. Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?  

YES 296
NO 297

K. Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?  

YES 300
NO 301

L. Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisioral election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisioral election assume the office of President of the Board?  

YES 303
NO 304

M. Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?  

YES 307
NO 308

N. Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?  

YES 310
NO 311
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286 SI 贊成
289 NO 反對

H 286 SI 贊成
H 289 NO 反對

H Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública dándole dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado judicial a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?

H Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones dándole dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado judicial a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores y la designación del servicio civil del Secretario General Administrador deberá de ser eliminada?

292 SI 贊成
293 NO 反對

I 292 SI 贊成
I 293 NO 反對

I Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar sujeto al Servicio Civil y permiso a dicho Administrador designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo el entorno del administrador?

I Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar sujeto al Servicio Civil y permiso a dicho Administrador designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo el entorno del administrador?

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

J 296 SI 贊成
J 297 NO 反對

J Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al entorno del miembro?

J Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al entorno del miembro?

300 SI 贊成
301 NO 反對

K 300 SI 贊成
K 301 NO 反對

K Deberá el supervisor que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisor de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 3 de enero de 1983, cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibió la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de supervisores efectuada deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

K Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al entorno del miembro?

303 SI 贊成
304 NO 反對

L 303 SI 贊成
L 304 NO 反對

L Deberá el supervisor que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisor de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 3 de enero de 1983, cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibió la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de supervisores efectuada deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

L Deberá el supervisor que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisor de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 3 de enero de 1983, cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibió la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de supervisores efectuada deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

307 SI 贊成
308 NO 反對

M 307 SI 贊成
M 308 NO 反對

M Declaración de Política: Deberá la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para transcribir datos digitalemente para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?

M Declaración de Política: Deberá la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para transcribir datos digitalemente para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?

310 SI 贊成
311 NO 反對

N 310 SI 贊成
N 311 NO 反對

N Declaración de Política: Si operará el gente de San Francisco a las recientes altas de precios de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico, recomendaré entusiasta que la Comisión de Servicio Público reduzca los precios a como estaban el 1° de diciembre de 1981 y además pedir otros rémidos!

N Declaración de Política: Si operará el gente de San Francisco a las recientes altas de precios de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico, recomendaré entusiasta que la Comisión de Servicio Público reduzca los precios a como estaban el 1° de diciembre de 1981 y además pedir otros rémidos!
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YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—you can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

---

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

---

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLSING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

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

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Vavuri, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Ema W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Inventor
Reverend John LoSchiano, Golden Gate & Parker Sts., Pres. Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Ruddin, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblentz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Faminar, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucia Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Refrigeration Contr. Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 720 Fillibet, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carolita Tardar Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jesse T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secy, Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea I. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nicco, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Orsi, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Two Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57.
My occupation is Lawyer.

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanzey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyemant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulonio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Tax Anticipation Notes

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal govern- ment, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

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

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

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned, may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle uncumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission combined shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((herein)) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors at not less than the value of two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per cent per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of such taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment of the said indebtedness shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!
Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarpalm savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-

terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits. Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:

Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker Supervising Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Harry G. Britt Supervisor Lee S. Dolson

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucchello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Partchian, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee’s surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee’s spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the termination of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaycee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and
County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost," Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dobson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and
County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolton
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
              Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
              Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
              Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the System is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on ‘J’

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on ‘J’

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissive for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

(end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arnesson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylack
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kell
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elsie Kuersten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concklin
Margarete Connoly
Ervin Delman
Ora Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Deutschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatgoh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Ethel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortenson
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefani Phipps
Al Roonsh
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salarno
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seebee
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Svoboda
Richard Szeto
James Timassi
Fritz Toth
John Van Heuden
Alexandra Vukich
Dorothy Vukich
Raymond Vukich
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbegalata
Al Borone
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Mortimer McInerney, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moyal, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orsi
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner
ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
Fingerprint Computer

PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City’s law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don't just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don't have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: 
Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneget. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:

Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultra-modern "tools" they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don’t want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

 Supervisor Harry Britt
 Supervisor Nancy Walker
 Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let’s be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG andE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Swacco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E’s purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28)

not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.))

((The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.))

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION B**

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

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

**TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE**

**PROPOSITION C**

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be “the average contribution.”

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents, retired persons’ dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors(1), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

County Employees' Retirement System (c), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herebefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herebefore submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such funds or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of services rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEST OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

60 expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of (one) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
sident official of an insurance company, ((and,)) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; ((and,)) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years there-after.))

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by (double parentheses)).

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((()) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.)) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply. (((); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager.))) Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
The REPUBLICAN PARTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Invites you to participate in the
process of Good Government

You can participate in good government by becoming a Sustaining Member of the REPUBLICAN Party. Dues are $10 per year. You will receive a membership card, our quarterly Newsletter, and notice of upcoming events in this exciting election year.

You can help in a variety of ways that will best utilize your important skills. You can participate in our precinct organization, voter registration, and election get-out-the-vote activities. You may explore the critical issues which face San Francisco now and in the future.

Please complete the coupon below and mail it. Why not do it today?

Cordially,
M. Lester O'Shea, Chairman
Republican County Committee

Please mail to:
Republican Party of San Francisco
625 Market Street, Suite 211
San Francisco, California 94105

□ Enclosed is my check in the amount of $___________
  for a Sustaining Membership
□ Please send me information on how I can become involved in the Republican Party

Name_________________________________________ Day Phone______________
Address_________________________________________ Zip__________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT

APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTER OF IMPRINTA

Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
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**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

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

**STEP 1**

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

**STEP 4**

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

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfore la baioneta en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hayan de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfore la baioneta en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Baioneta.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfore la baioneta en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradas están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la baioneta, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote per Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. “BILL” CLARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingeniero Electricista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>電機工程師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>加州司法廳長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL ARTHUR (MIKE) HIRT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profile Advocate/Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensor de la Vida/Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>多育提倡者／商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES C. MANSFIELD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor-Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor, Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote per Uno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>CAROL HALLETT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Legislator/Rancher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legisladora Estatal/Ranchera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>加州議會議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>參議員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLENN ROSE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Comercio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>商業管理人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JACOB “JAY” MARGOSIAN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GORDON DUFFY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Legislator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| State | Controller | Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LARRY LEE BALES</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | Attorney at Law
|       | Abogado |              |
|       | OLLIE SPERAW | 33 |
|       | State Senator-Businessman
|       | Senator Estatal-Comerciante | 加州參議員－商人 |
|       | TRUMAN CAMPBELL | 35 |
|       | Attorney-Businessman
|       | Abogado-Comerciante | 律師－商人 |
|       | WILLIAM E. "BILL" COOMBS | 37 |
|       | CPA/Attorney/Businessman
|       | CPA/Abogado/Comerciante | 持證公共會計師，律師，商人 |
|       | JAMES A. WARE | 39 |
|       | Business Executive
|       | Ejecutivo de Comercio | 商業總經理 |

| State | Treasurer | Vote for One
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES STIERINGER</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | Corporate Treasurer
|       | Tesorero Corporativo | 公司司庫 |
|       | KENT LLOYD | 47 |
|       | Deputy Undersecretary-Education
|       | Delegado Subsecretario-Eduacion | 教育部副下級主任 |
|       | PHIL KAZANJIAN | 49 |
|       | Corporate Treasurer/Attorney
|       | Tesorero Corporativo/Abogado | 公司司庫／律師 |
|       | DONALD J. FRENCH | 51 |
|       | Corporate Treasurer
|       | Tesorero Corporativo | 公司司庫 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurador General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Dave Stirling**         | Attorney/Businessman/Legislator  
                        | 57   |            |
| **George Nicholson**      | Senior Assistant Attorney General  
                        | 59   |            |
| **Member State Board of Equalization - 1st District** |                                                                          |      |            |
| **Leo Bagdonas**          | State Board Auditor  
                        | 65   |            |
| **William H. “Bill” Ivers** | State Assemblyman/Businessman  
                        | 67   |            |
| **Elaine W. Donaldson**   | Business Owner-Controller  
                        | 69   |            |
| **Oliver W. Wright**      | Hotel General Manager  
                        | 71   |            |
| **Joe H. Adams Jr.**      | Equalization Board Auditor  
<pre><code>                    | 73   |            |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. (BOB) DORNAN</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY GOOLDBERT JR.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN E. REAGAN</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. &quot;JACK&quot; HICKEY</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED BRUNISMA</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. BOOHER</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. &quot;PETE&quot; McCLOSKEY JR.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON P. MCDANIELS</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN G. SCHMITZ</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM SHOCKLEY</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL &quot;RALPH&quot; D. CORTES</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative in Congress – 6th District
Diputado al Congress – Distrito #6
国會眾議員 第六議區
Vote for One
Vote por Uno
講選一名

DENNIS McQUAID
Attorney
Abogado 律師

Member of the Assembly –
17th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea – Distrito #17
加州眾議員 第十七眾議區
Vote for One
Vote por Uno
講選一名

THOMAS S. CRARY
Lawyer
Abogado 律師

DEL DAWSON
Supervisor’s Administrative Assistant
Asistente Administrativo del Supervisor 市參議員事務管理助手
## Nonpartisan Primary Election
### Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9
**DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN**  
Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 185

### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1
**ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI**  
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 188

**PATRICIA (PATTY) LUCEY**  
Attorney/Abojada  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 189

**RICHARD E. BEST**  
Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 190

**RICHARD TULLIS**  
Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 191

### Superintendent of Public Instruction
**GEORGIA MARSHALL**  
Principal/Directora  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 194

**RICHARD E. FERRARO**  
Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Membro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 195

**WILSON RILES**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 196

**JANET L. ALLEN**  
Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comerciante  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 197

**DANIEL NUSBAUM**  
Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 198

**BILL HONIG**  
District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 199

**MYRON LIEBERMAN**  
School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 200

**GENE PRAT**  
Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 201

**JEANNE BAIRD**  
Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 202

### City & County
**SAM DUCA**  
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo  
Vote for One

- **Vote:** 205

### Nonpartisan Ballot

## On Your Voting Machine
**This Page Will Be Green.**
# MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

## STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>President of Senate. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Taxation. Real Property Valuation. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bail. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**

**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Dispone emisión de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicegobernador sea Presidente del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estatal o local.

3. RECUPERACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS, VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Eximensa la definición de "cambio de dueño" para excluir reemplazo de propiedad tomado por procedimientos de tipo de demolición u otro. Impacto fiscal: Significativa pérdida de recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en las tasas administrativas para gobiernos locales, incremento en los costos administrativos. Impacto político: El aumento en las tasas administrativas puede afectar el servicio al público.

4. FINANZA. Permite el acceso a la libertad de burocracia cuando la falta tiene reasignaciones de financiación en consecuencia a la probabilidad de que la persona pueda ser liberada. Requiere vender el bien de la persona. Impacto fiscal: Aumento de costos administrativos para gobiernos locales.


三藩市県地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

新監獄建筑公債法案。
発行公債 $495,000,000，作仏建築加
州監獄之用。

參議院主席：检察院法指定致州長為參議院主
席的條款。

財政上の影響：對加州和地方政府並無直接影
響。

税制 財業課税額 修訂 “象徴轉移” 的定
義，避免因微小程序而獲得的舗捄費案。財政
上的影響：財業税書損害重大，增重地方政府
的行政經費。加州政府為要補充地方政府與社
區大學校區，其經費亦增加。由於財業稅扣除
額甚低，加州的所得稅收入會增加。

保釋 如法庭裁定犯人如被释放，可能使別
人的身體受到侵害時，犯人不得獲保釋釋。財政
上的影響：地方政府監獄與保釋審訊費用增加。
犯人稍後被判坐牢，可省回一部分經費，得以補
償。

福爾摩斯案（提案人：米勒） 廣除現行課
稅制度。法案對加州的“徵求” 造就低
收，其稅率相等於徵求規定的規模稅。財政
上的影響：加州政府在一九八一至八三年減少稅
收約5,800萬美元。一九八一八三年減少三
億五千五百美元，以後年年稅收減少。加
州政府每年可能財政超支六萬美元。加州政
府稅收減少，其補助地方政府的經費
率相應減少。

福爾摩斯案（提案人：羅德斯） 廣除現行
課稅制度。法案對加州的“徵求” 造就低
收，其稅率相等於徵求規定的規模稅。財政
上的影響：加州政府在一九八一至八三年的減少稅
收約5,800萬美元。一九八一八三年內的減少稅
收約5,800萬美元。以后年年稅收減少，加州政府稅收
減少，其補助地方政府的經費
率相應減少。
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote 1</th>
<th>Vote 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 237</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.</td>
<td>YES 241</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.</td>
<td>YES 246</td>
<td>NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.</td>
<td>YES 250</td>
<td>NO 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.\nEstipula un realjajiento cuentable de las mgejaciones dujendie del impuesto a la renta\nde los contribuyentes. Efecto fiscal: Reducir el adelanto estatal en unas $230\nmillones en 1962-63, en unas $445 millones en 1963-64 y en cantidades\nmenores de allí en adelante. Reducciones en los adelantos estatales resultarían en\nreducciones correspondientes en los pagos estatales a los\ goronen y aesthetic fechons.

JUSTICIA PENAL. Elimina la Constitución y promulga estatutos con\nrepecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y liberación de personas acusadas\ncondenados y en lo que concierne a los mínimos, impacto fiscal: Cuantos\estatutos y leyes mayores que no pueden ser previstos con ningún grado de\certezas.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un\nesto “S” aprueba, un voto “N” rechaza, uno ley que designa instalaciones de\narro de agua adicional del Presupuesto del Vallo Central, impacto fiscal: Bajo los\normas actuales, no es regulación aumentar en los imprevistos\estatutos al reducirse de los totalidades a otro programa\estatutos. Los peajes de las construcciones en los precios de 1961, que son\prometiendo en los cambios y peajes de tarifas, que si se\deshacian, serán financiados por el incremento del costo a los consolidate.

REAJUSTACION, DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un esto “S” aprueba,\un voto “N” rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1961 que\adopeta los límites para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si es\aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si se rechaza, costo al estado de\$350,000 y a los condados de $350,000.

REAJUSTACION, DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un esto “S” aprueba, un\voto “N” rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1961 que\adopeta los límites para los 45 distritos Senatoriales. Impacto fiscal: Si es\aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si se rechaza, costo al estado de\$370,000 y a los condados de $300,000.

REAJUSTACION, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un esto “S” aprueba, un\voto “N” rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1961 que\adopeta los límites de las 80 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si es\aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si se rechaza, costo al estado de\$400,000 y a los condados de $500,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Comentario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos o recogerlos en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
<td>Participación en pagos o préstamos de impuestos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que libre a cabo cualquier elección municipal o especial por medio del correo?</td>
<td>Participación en elecciones municipales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los diez centavos del sueldo que pagan la población más grande?</td>
<td>Contribución a un plan de salud dental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la ciudad otorgar un jubilatorio a los supervivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad otorga a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?</td>
<td>Programa de jubilación para empleados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al nacer de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
<td>Registro de cónyuges sobrevivientes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuaría y de experiencia del sistema de jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el aval de la actuaría llevada a cabo por la misma cada seis años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
<td>Investigaciones de actuaría.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los fondos de pensiones para inversiones sujetas a los poderes de revisión del Controller?</td>
<td>Revisión de inversiones de fondos de pensiones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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288 SI 贊成

289 NO 反對

¿Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública aboliendo dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de las superintendentes a ser designado por la Junta de Superintendentes?

292 SI 贊成

293 NO 反對

¿Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones abolido dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de las superintendentes a ser designado por la Junta de Superintendentes y la designación del servicio civil del Secretario General Administrador debera de ser eliminado?

295 SI 贊成

297 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar sujeto del Servicio Civil y permitiendo a dicho Administrador designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo el antojo del administrador?

300 SI 贊成

301 NO 反對

¿Deberán cada miembro de la Junta de Superintendentes designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al antojo del miembro?

303 SI 贊成

304 NO 反對

¿Deberá el superintendente que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de superintendentes de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 8 de enero de 1983 y cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que reciba la mayor cantidad de votos durante la última elección de superintendentes deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

307 SI 贊成

308 NO 反對

Declaración de Política: ¿Deberá la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir o renovar computadoras para los departamentos para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?

310 SI 贊成

311 NO 反對

Declaración de Política: ¿Se agotará la gase de San Francisco a los residentes al gase de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico si el mercado sube? La Comisión Estatal de Servicio Público redujo los precios a comienzo del 1º de diciembre de 1981 y además podrían otros remedios?
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
* State Assemblyman
* United States Congressman
* United States Senator
* State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
* Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
* and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
* three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
* two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
* two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voter’s Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan offices?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
* Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
* mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
* That you need to vote early
* your registered voting address
* the address where you want the ballot mailed
* then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be the candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Cyril I. Magnus, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reynolds, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Way, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Varvatos, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jean T. Estes, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbutus, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Fumairin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymond, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagoi, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Tung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlo C. Tesser, 6010 Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jesse P. Estes, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Socety, Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea L. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnus, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 50 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nicco, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Ori, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O’Shea, 5803 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Redd, 476 Jost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro temore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinosa, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyemant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jabe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court
Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia Uni-
iversity School of Law, 1968; five years private law
practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two
children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the
Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex
civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lec-
tured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal
publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys.
In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club
award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent
application of law, protection of the innocent, and
punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure
at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection
of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal
justice under law.

My supporters include John A. Sutro, Putnam Livermore,
Harold Dobbs, George J. Mescone, Assemblyman Art Ag-
os, Tina Burgess Coan, Ed Turner, Vius Lee, Rita Alviar,
Lorraine Wiles, Sheriff Michael Hennessy, Thomas A. Reed,
S.F., John E. Sullivan, Jane McKaskle Murphy, Morris
Bernstein, George Evankovich, George Wong, Mrs. Alessan-
dro Baccari, Sr., Marguerite Warren, William T. Reed,
Graciela Cashion, Ina Dearman, Libby Denebeim, Jesse
Feldman, Walter S. Newman, Duane Cimino, Jim Foster,
Judith Breck, Terry Francois, Melvin Belli, Charles Ren-
frew, Edward I. Reidy.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San
Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and
USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln
University Law School. I was admitted to the bar in
1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and
criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was
appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and
taught at local law schools. Having served under three
District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My
court experience includes more than 125 jury trials
and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings,
appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court
and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the
last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense at-
torneys, members of law enforcement and a broad
cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in sever-
al civic organizations.

Sponsors: William Moskovitz, Vincent Hallinan, Thomas
Mellon, Jeff Brown, Thomas J. Cahill, Ephraim Margolin,
John F. Henning, Jr., John J. Moylan, Gordon Armstrong,
Dorothy Casper, Eduardo Sandoval, J.A. Scatena, Stephen L.
Swig, Gordon Lau, Henry E. Berman, Ernest C. Ayala,
Thomas E. Horn, Roger S. Lalane, Dorothy Stern; Judges
John B. Molinari, Francis McCarty, Mary Moran Pajaliel,
Samuel E. Yee, Raymond Reynolds, Albert A. Axlerod.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, it is impossible to predict.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION A

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year, provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the payment of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (herein) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year

in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected in said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller's Statement on “B”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition "B" will prevent this waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition "B" will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A "YES" vote for Proposition "B" will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting "YES" for Proposition "B" will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote "YES" on Proposition "B".

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote “No” on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board “may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election.”

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote “No” on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don’t be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters’ rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let’s not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O’Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based “Committee for Economic Democracy” will likely suggest that we vote by tele-

phone “call in” next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-

terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition “C” would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote “YES” on Proposition “C”. A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition “C” was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition “C”, there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition “C” will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition “C”, as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Harry G. Britt  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:  Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinaro, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Goggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Parachan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

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

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F

Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost," Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F"

Submitted by:  
Supervisor John L. Molinari  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  
Retirement Board of City and  
County of San Francisco  
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED
Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by:  
Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  
Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City’s costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.
Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of (who) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member’s pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

(end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983, and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehnert, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Bob Guichard
George Rehnert, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahktrohn
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylaic
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgheli
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kelly
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elsie Kuersten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concklin
Margarette Connoly
Ervin Delman
Ora Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Deuschman
Patrick Dowling
Mary grace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Faah
Peter Fatouh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Feldhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hau

Erhel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortensen
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louie Park
Stefani Phipps
Al Roensch
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salsano
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seese
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Svoboda
Richard Stet
James Timossi
Fritz Totah
John Van Heusden
Alexandra Vyskoch
Dorothy Vyskoch
Raymond Vyskoch
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

• Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
• Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

• Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
• Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
• Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borvice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Marion Mckernan, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orl
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940’s that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:

Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARter AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

((The supervisors constituting the new board shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisory election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisory election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.))
Fingerprint Computer

PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don't just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don't have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultra-modern "tools" they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:

1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-genera-tion;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time.”

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG&E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

Proposition N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes

or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

PROPOSITION B

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

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this charter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE**

PROPOSITION C

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

proved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care)) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
(Proposition C, Continued)

suggested survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors((1)), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

County Employees' Retirement System ((.)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition theretofore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition theretofore submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

---

BIG BROTHERS: IT'S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR TWO

- If you are patient and understanding,
- If your life is stable,
- If you can be a friend to a child, and
- If you have a few hours a week to share (for at least a year);
  Then you may be the perfect Big Brother.

Big Brothers is a non-profit youth service agency which matches male volunteers to boys between the ages of 7 and 17, from father-absent homes.

Being a Big Brother offers a man the unique opportunity to contribute to his community and himself, while providing friendship and guidance to a young boy.

If you are over 18, and interested, call BIG BROTHERS of San Francisco • 434-4860

---
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: (the chairman of the finance committee) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; (two) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of (two) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 (each of the following years) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in (each of the following years) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
sident official of an insurance company, ((and,) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; ((and,) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years thereafter.

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((any)) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.)) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((unless)); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.

(end)
The REPUBLICAN PARTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Invites you to participate in the
process of Good Government

You can participate in good government by becoming a Sustaining Member of the REPUBLICAN Party. Dues are $10 per year. You will receive a membership card, our quarterly Newsletter, and notice of upcoming events in this exciting election year.

You can help in a variety of ways that will best utilize your important skills. You can participate in our precinct organization, voter registration, and election get-out-the-vote activities. You may explore the critical issues which face San Francisco now and in the future.

Please complete the coupon below and mail it. Why not do it today?

Cordially,
M. Lester O'Shea, Chairman
Republican County Committee

Please mail to:
Republican Party of San Francisco
625 Market Street, Suite 211
San Francisco, California 94105

☐ Enclosed is my check in the amount of $__________

☐ Please send me information on how I can become involved in the Republican Party

Name_________________________________________ Day Phone____________________

Address_________________________________________ Zip____________________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER’S BALLOT
APPLICATION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

1. PRINTED NAME
LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
正楷書寫姓名

2. ELECTION DATE
JUNE 8, 1982
我 hereby apply for an Absent Voter’s Ballot for the election
indicated above.

Por la presente solicito una balota de Votante Ausente para la elección indicada
arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIAME LA BALOTA A:
請將選票寄給本人住址：

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
申請人簽名

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and
now reside at an address other than that
shown on your affidavit of registration.
I moved on ________________________ 19____.
My residence address is ________________________
NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior
to this election may obtain an
absentee ballot. A voter moving more
than 29 days prior to this election
and who did not re-register prior to
the registration closing date for this
election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y
reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que
aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.
Me cambié el ________________________ de 19____.
Mi dirección es ________________________
NOTA: Un votante que se cambia dentro de los 29
días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que
se cambia antes de los 29 días anteriores
de la elección y que no se registra antes
de la fecha final para registrarse de esta
elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR’S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
San Francisco Voter Information Pamphlet

Primary Election
June 8, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 4

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#—Area EAST of ——— (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN ——— (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of ——— (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of ///// (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of ///// (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADEd area
#6—All the SHADED area
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

A 第一步
请将选票插入自动投票机内。

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

B 第一步
请将选票插入自动投票机内。

STEP 1

STEP 2

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

C 第二步
请将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

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

D 第三步
请将选票输入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票选举之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格预備為投票人应用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora; rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知:

投票時選出所選出的任何其他候選人，選在選票上所指的強迫候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，選在選票上所指之所有候選人中，選擇你所選的候選人打孔，但不要超過選舉的限定人數。

選舉合於候選的候選人，選在非候選候選人選票之候選人所指的候選人名打孔。

投票時間，選在選票上所指的 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著的點或抹掉，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，撕破或弄壞了，或損壞了非候選候選人之選票，應把該選票還給選舉區的選舉員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. &quot;BILL&quot; CLARK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHAEL ARTHUR (MIKE) HIRT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES C. MANSFIELD</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegobernador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAROL HALLETT</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretario de Estado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLENN ROSE</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JACOB &quot;JAY&quot; MARGOSIAN</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GORDON DUFFY</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Details:
- PRIMARY ELECTION: JUNE 8, 1962
- ELECCION PRIMARIA: 6 DE JUNIO DE 1962
- REPUBLICAN PARTY

Note: The text includes a mix of English and Spanish, indicating the positions and candidates for the 1962 primary election in California.
### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARRY LEE BALES</td>
<td>Director, Orange County Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLLIE SPERAW</td>
<td>State Senator-Businessman</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUMAN CAMPBELL</td>
<td>Attorney-Businessman</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM E. &quot;BILL&quot; COOMBS</td>
<td>CPA/Attorney/Businessman</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. WARE</td>
<td>Business Executive</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treasurer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAMES STIERINGER</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENT LLOYD</td>
<td>Deputy Undersecretary-Education</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL KAZANJIAN</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Attorney</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attorney General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurador General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>司法廳長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Dave Stirling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Businessman/Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abogado/Comerciante/Legislator 加州州議員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>George Nicholson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asistente Decano Procurador de Justicia 最高副司法廳長</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Member State Board of Equalization — 1st District</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento — Distrito #1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>加州平準局委員 第一議區</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Leo Bagdonas</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Board Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor del Consejo del Estado 加州查帳員</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>William H. “Bill” Ivers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Assemblyman/Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asambleista Estatal/Comerciante 加州衆議員／商人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Elaine W. Donaldson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner-Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dueña de Negocios-Contralor 店主／審計官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Oliver W. Wright</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerente General de Hotel 旅館總經理</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Joe H. Adams Jr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalization Board Auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor del Consejo de Igualamiento 平準局查帳員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. (BOB) DORNAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY GOLDWATER JR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN E. REAGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. “JACK” HICKEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED BRUINSMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. BOOHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. “PETE” McCLOSKEY JR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON P. McDANIELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN G. SCHMITZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM SHOCKLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL “RALPH” D. CORTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative In Congress – 6th District
Diputado al Congresso – Distrito #6

Vote for One
Vote por Uno

DENNIS McQUAID
Attorney
Abogado

State Senator – 8th Senatorial District
Senador Estatal, Distrito #8

Vote for One
Vote por Uno

LEANNE C. GUTH
Business Administrator
Administradora de Comercio

Member of the Assembly – 17th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea – Distrito #17

Vote for One
Vote por Uno

THOMAS S. CRARY
Lawyer
Abogado

DEL DAWSON
Supervisor's Administrative Assistant
Asistente Administrativo del Supervisor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPUBLICAN PARTY</th>
<th>PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 8, 1982</th>
<th>COUNTY COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELECCION PRIMARIA 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982</td>
<td>COMITE DEL CONDADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID S. SIGAL</td>
<td>State Central Committee/Miembro del Comité Central</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERVYN SILBERBERG</td>
<td>Small Business Advocate/Defensor de Negocios Pequeños</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN W. STARK</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL DAWSON</td>
<td>Supervisor's Administrative Assistant/Asistente Administrativo</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD DONALDSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNA M. (MRS. LEELAND) GUTH</td>
<td>Domestic Engineer/Ingeniera Domestica</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND G. GUTH</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTHA M. GILLHAM</td>
<td>Community Volunteer/Voluntaria de la Comunidad</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON GETTY</td>
<td>Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEVERLY A. WHALEY</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN HEUSDEN</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes y Raíces</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLPH ANDREWS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. DEREK ANDERSON</td>
<td>Stockbroker/Corredor de Bolsa</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY E. HUGHES</td>
<td>Consultant, State Senate/Consejero, Senado Estatal</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE U. HARRIS</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios Independiente</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHY HENDERSON</td>
<td>Small Business Owner/Propietario de Negocio Pequeño</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE HENDERSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LES PAYNE</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS T. JACKSON</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHEN A. ERNST</td>
<td>Banker/Banquero</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. TERHEYDEN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. LESTER O'SHEA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. O'KEEFE, SR.</td>
<td>President, Taxpayers Association/Presidente, Asociación de Contribuyentes</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLACE A. MYERS</td>
<td>Retired Businessman/Hombre de Negocios Jubilado</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN B. MOY</td>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDITH A. FELDMAN</td>
<td>Public Affairs/Asuntos Publicos</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>Daniel H. Weinstein, Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>Alfred G. Chiantelli, Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia (Pat) Lucey, Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard E. Best, Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Tullis, Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Georgia Marshall, Principal/Directora</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard E. Ferraro, Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Membro, consejo de Educación de Los Angeles</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson Riles, State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de instrucción Pública</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janet L. Allen, Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Nusbaum, Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Honig, District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myron Lieberman, School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gene Prat, Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeanne Baird, Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Sam Duca, Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>J. Jeff Brown, Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS
STATE PROPOSITIONS

1 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.  
FOR 212
AGAINST 213

2 PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.  
YES 215
NO 216

3 TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.  
YES 219
NO 220

4 BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.  
YES 223
NO 224

5 GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.  
YES 228
NO 229

6 GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.  
YES 232
NO 233

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Dispone cantidad de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO, Revoca la disposición Constitucional de que el Presidente del Senado ejercerá el cargo de Fiscal General. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estatal.

3. FUJÍA DE IMPUESTOS, VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Eximiremos la defunción de la "cambante de duda" para excluir reexamen de propiedad tomada por procedimientos de tipo de dominio minero. Impacto fiscal: Significativa pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en los costos administrativos para gobiernos locales, pero con reducción en las tasas estatales a proporciones equitativas a las distritos escuelas locales. Aumento en el costo a la red pública debido a desviaciones mas bajos del impuesto a la propiedad.

4. FIANZA. Prohibirá el litoral bajo fianza cuando la corte tiene resultados de investigación conciliante de la probabilidad de que la persona puesta en libertad pueda causar grave dano físico a otras, impacto fiscal: Aumento del costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelamiento y sanciones judiciales para fianza. Podrán hacer aberraciones compensadas si la persona fuera más tarde sentenciada a la cárcel o a la prisión.

5. IMPUESTOS A DONACIONES Y HERENCIA (Proponente Miller). Revoca los impuestos vigentes. Vuelve a promover el impuesto estatal "recobrar" el caudal hereditario igual al crédito de impuesto federal especificado, Impacto fiscal: Reducción de las tasas estatales en $130 millones en 1982-83, en una $365 millones en 1983-84 y en cantidades mayores de chiefs en adelante. Ahora el estado unas 45 millones anuales en costos administrativos. La reducción de las tasas estatales resultarán en reducciones correspondientes en los pagos estatales a los gobiernos locales y a las escuelas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</strong> Provides continuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84,</td>
<td><strong>YES 237</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governments and schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. CRIMINAL JUSTICE.</strong> Amends Constitution and enacts statutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certainty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL.</strong> &quot;Yes&quot; vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approves, &quot;No&quot; vote rejects, a law designating additional Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be financed by increased user charges.</td>
<td><strong>YES 246</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.</strong> &quot;Yes&quot; vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approves, &quot;No&quot; vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 and county costs of $350,000.</td>
<td><strong>YES 250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS.</strong> &quot;Yes&quot; vote approves,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No&quot; vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county costs of $500,000.</td>
<td><strong>YES 254</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS.</strong> &quot;Yes&quot; vote approves,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No&quot; vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county costs of $650,000.</td>
<td><strong>YES 258</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
237 SI 贳成 7
238 NO 反對

JUSTICIA PENAL. Extremar la Constitución y promulgar estatutos con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y liberación de personas encarceladas y condenadas y en lo que concierne a los vitaminas. Impacto fiscal: Costas estatales y locales mayores que no puedan ser previstos con ningún grado de certeza.

241 SI 贳成 8
242 NO 反對

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto 'SI' aprueba, un voto 'No' rechaza, una ley que designa instalaciones de suministro de agua adicionales del proyecto del valle central. Impacto fiscal: Bajo los normas presentes, no se requiere aumento en el impuesto fiscal, costas estatales ni reducciones de las tarifas destinadas a estos programas estatales. Los posibles costos de construcción en precios de 1991, que son la media de $1,100,000-900,000, serán financiados por el incremento de los costos a los consumidores.

246 SI 贳成 9
247 NO 反對

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Un voto 'SI' aprueba, un voto 'No' rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1991 que el delimita las distritos para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún costo estatal o local. Si se rechaza, costos del estado de $250,000 y a los condados de $350,000.

250 SI 贳成 10
251 NO 反對

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un voto 'SI' aprueba, un voto 'No' rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1991 que el delimita las distritos de los 45 distritos Senatoriales. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún costo estatal o local. Si se rechaza, costos del estado de $570,000 y a los condados de $500,000.

254 SI 贳成 11
255 NO 反對

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto 'SI' aprueba, un voto 'No' rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1991 que el delimita las distritos de los 45 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún costo estatal o local. Si se rechaza, costos del estado de $400,000 y a los condados de $500,000.

258 SI 贳成 12
259 NO 反對
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**

**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opción 1</th>
<th>Opción 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a rescatar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
<td></td>
<td>市議會應否有權借款，依照州法律或市議會法令徵收預期稅收債券？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que lleve a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decisiva o especial por medio del correo?</td>
<td></td>
<td>市議會應否獲准督導選民註冊於以郵寄形式舉行普通，複選或特別市選？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los diez centavos del sueldo que tengan la población más grande?</td>
<td></td>
<td>市政府應否為市職工繳付牙醫保健費，保健費額為加州人口最衆的十個縣區的平均保健費？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los congéneres sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?</td>
<td></td>
<td>市政府應否在同一基礎上津貼在職員工和已退休員工的未亡配偶，一如市政府津貼在退休服務制度內的在職員工和已退休員工？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se deberá permitir al conyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
<td></td>
<td>退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶，目前可享受補助金，如果他們在六十歲後再婚，應否繼續享受這種補助金？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuación y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el aval de la superior llevado a cabo por lo menos cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
<td></td>
<td>退休制度的保險統計和人員調查，應否每兩年舉行一次，由退休局裁定保險金額和某些費用，由市政府支付？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los fondos de pensiones para inversiones sujeta a los poderes de revisión del Contralor?</td>
<td></td>
<td>退休局應否具有唯一的權力，以管理退休金用於投資，但須受市審計官審核的約束？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?  

YES 288  
NO 289  

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?  

YES 292  
NO 293  

Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?  

YES 296  
NO 297  

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?  

YES 300  
NO 301  

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?  

YES 303  
NO 304  

Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?  

YES 307  
NO 308  

Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?  

YES 310  
NO 311  

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE  
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三藩市縣地方普選
一九八二年六月八日

保健服務局的組織成員應否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議員的成員則由市參議會指派？

退休局組織成員應否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議員主席出任退休局委員則改由市參議會指派，書記—總經理職務無公務任命則予以免除？

退休制度的書記—總經理職位應否由退休局任命，並免除於公務職務，該經理並有權任命一名執行書記，在他的指導下執行職務？

市參議員應否各實任命一名立法助理，在市參議員的指導下工作？

在一九八〇年十一月市參議員選舉中得票最多的市參議員，應否出任市市參議會主席，並在一九八三年—月八日及此後每兩年一次，在上一次市市參議員的選舉中，得票最多的候選人出任市參議會主席？

政策聲明：三藩市、縣應否在一九八二年三年會計年度購進一部指紋電子計算機，以備三藩市執法人員之用？

政策聲明：三藩市人民應否對太平洋煤電公司最近的加價，並催促公用事業委員會及政府採取其他糾正行動？
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?  

YES 288  
NO 289

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?  

YES 292  
NO 293

Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?  

YES 296  
NO 297

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?  

YES 300  
NO 301

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisioral election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisioral election assume the office of President of the Board?  

YES 303  
NO 304

Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?  

YES 307  
NO 308

Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?  

YES 310  
NO 311
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA - 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

lıklar服務局的組織成員應否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議會的成員則由市參議會指派？

退休局組織成員應否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議會主席出任退休局委員則改由市參議會指派，書記—總經理職為公務任命則予以免除？

退休制度的書記—總經理職位應否由退休局任命，並免於公務條款，該經理並有權任命一名執行書記，在他的指導下執行職務？

市議員應否各自任命一名立法助理，在市議員的指導下工作？

在一九八〇年十一月市議員選舉中得票最多的市議員，應否出任市議會主席，並在一九八三年九月八日及此後每兩年一次，在上一次市議員的選舉中，得票最多的候選人出任市議會主席？

政策聲明：三藩市、縣議會在一九八二一九八三年會計年度購置一部指紋電子計算機，以備三藩市執法人員之用？

政策聲明：三藩市人民應否反對太平洋電電公司最近的加價，並敦促公用事業委員會把電費壓低到一九八一年十二月一日的水平，並要求採取其他糾正行動？
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes. The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)

(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

**PRIMARY ELECTION** — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a **POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE** you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**CHARTER** — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

**TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE** — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

**FISCAL YEAR** — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

**PETITION** — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**SUPERVISORS** — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

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

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 481 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Varonis, 91 Camco, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jesse T. Estes, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erna W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Vivian S.F.
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Cohenitz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Famarin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Luciano Ruymundi, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Malkovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 3910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850-40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more realistic in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 481 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Ying Brown, 850-40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Fillbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlota Tezidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jesse T. Estes, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1093 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secretary, Rent Control Board
Maitie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea I. Jespon, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Niece, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Orsi, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadice Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfe, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission on the Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tem, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County, Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Amino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinosa, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanzy, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyemant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamara; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jabo; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeannie Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years.
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner.

My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I’ve handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I’ve lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public. Be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42.
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney.

My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Tax Anticipation Notes

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on “A”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation notes proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal govern-

ment, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by (double parenthesis).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues
The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county or other such funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (herein) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinabove in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinafter in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest of to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"
On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in. Proposition "B" will prevent this waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition "B" will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A "YES" vote for Proposition "B" will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won't have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting "YES" for Proposition "B" will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco's taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote "YES" on Proposition "B".

Submitted by:  
Supervisor Harry G. Britt  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7  
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress  
(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
MAIL BALLOT ELECTIONS

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote “No” on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board “may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election.”

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mailboxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote “No” on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don’t be misled by visions of sugarpum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters’ rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let’s not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O’Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based “Committee for Economic Democracy” will likely suggest that we vote by tele-phone “call in” next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-
terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy workforce is cost effective.

Submitted by:  
Supervisor Harry G. Britt  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward  
Supervisor Wendy Nelder  
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION  
Bob Barry  
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798  
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION  
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinaro, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggiero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Paritucham, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachet, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee’s spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and
County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.
Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!
Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under “Official Advertising”
or “Legal Notices”)
PROPOSITION F

Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and
County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on “H”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees’ representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “H”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. ObtenGa una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “I”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board,

the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION  
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors. Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe. (end)
Board of Supervisors Presidency

PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisory election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PRESIDENCY

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmert,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duck Armstrong
Alfred Baysac
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgeit
Mary Anne Brennan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borice
George Emanchen, Union official
Marcia Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Marvin McIntire, Retired Deputy Police Chief
Joan Meylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orai
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940’s that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1982, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.) At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisiorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
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PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City’s law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

“Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time.”

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N is not designed to fool us.

Why not roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its workforce by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG andE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suwaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of monies received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

((The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any monies borrowed under authority of this section.))

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county officers not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precints and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

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

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and an employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors((s)), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
County Employees' Retirement System (CERS), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviv-

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
resident official of an insurance company, ((and,)) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; ((and,)) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years thereafter).

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((,)) appointed by the board of supervisors ((for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.))) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The terms of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((,)); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
The REPUBLICAN PARTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
Invites you to participate in the
process of Good Government.

You can participate in good government by becoming a Sustaining Member of the REPUBLICAN Party. Dues are $10 per year. You will receive a membership card, our quarterly Newsletter, and notice of upcoming events in this exciting election year.

You can help in a variety of ways that will best utilize your important skills. You can participate in our precinct organization, voter registration, and election get-out-the-vote activities. You may explore the critical issues which face San Francisco now and in the future.

Please complete the coupon below and mail it. Why not do it today?

Cordially,
M. Lester O'Shea, Chairman
Republican County Committee

Please mail to:
Republican Party of San Francisco
625 Market Street, Suite 211
San Francisco, California 94105
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APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETRA DE IMPRENTA: Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
正楷書寫姓名: 信件會被比照於申請人在本署申請。

2. ELECTION DATE
JUNE 8, 1982

I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on _______________ 19__.

My residence address is ________________________________________________________

Si usted se ha cambiado
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambié el _______________ de 19__.

Mi dirección es ____________________________________________ Area Postal __________

NOTA: Un votante que se cambie dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambie antes de los 29 días anteriores a la elección y que no se registre antes de la fecha final para registrarse para esta elección no puede votar.

6. I prefer election materials in English

Check box if you prefer election materials in English.

MAIL TO:
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 155, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
## Voter Selection Coupon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
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<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
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<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cut on tear along dotted lines**

---

**Application para abstente en página 63**

Application for absentee ballot appears on page 63.
ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
   #—Area EAST of  (solid lines)
   #17—Area BETWEEN  (solid lines)
   #19—Area WEST of  (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
   #3—Area NORTH of  (virgule lines)
   #8—Area SOUTH of  (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
   #5—All the UNSHADED area
   #6—All the SHADED area
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Candidates for Judge

Richard E. Best ................................. 23
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Jeff Brown .................................. 25
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Sam Duca .................................. 25
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Proposition A
Removes some of the restrictions in issuance of tax anticipation notes.
Analysis ........................................ 26
Arguments ..................................... 27
Text of proposed law .......................... 28, 57

Proposition B
Allows Supervisors the option of conducting a local election by mail.
Analysis ........................................ 29
Arguments ..................................... 30, 31
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Proposition C
Establishes a dental plan for City employees.
Analysis ........................................ 32
Argument ...................................... 33
Text of proposed law .......................... 57, 58

Proposition D
Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
Analysis ........................................ 34
Argument ...................................... 35
Text of proposed law .......................... 58, 59

Proposition E
Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.
Analysis ........................................ 36
Argument ...................................... 37
Text of proposed law .......................... 60

Proposition F
Establishes procedural and bookkeeping changes in the City's retirement system.
Analysis ........................................ 38
Argument ...................................... 39
Text of proposed law .......................... 60

Proposition G
Gives the Retirement Board exclusive jurisdiction over investment of pension funds.
Analysis ........................................ 40
Argument ...................................... 41
Text of proposed law .......................... 41

Proposition H
Changes the composition of the Health Service Board.
Analysis ........................................ 42
Argument ...................................... 43
Text of proposed law .......................... 60, 61

Proposition I
Changes the composition of the Retirement Board and removes Manager from Civil Service.
Analysis ........................................ 44
Argument ...................................... 45
Text of proposed law .......................... 61

Proposition J
Two Retirement System administrators to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
Analysis ........................................ 46
Argument ...................................... 47
Text of proposed law .......................... 47

Proposition K
Supervisors' legislative aides to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
Analysis ........................................ 48
Argument ...................................... 49
Text of proposed law .......................... 49

Proposition L
Board Presidency would go to supervisory candidate who received the most votes.
Analysis ........................................ 50
Arguments ..................................... 51, 52
Text of proposed law .......................... 52

Proposition M
Declares it to be City policy to purchase a fingerprint computer.
Analysis ........................................ 53
Arguments ..................................... 54

Proposition N
Declares opposition to recent PG&E rate increases.
Analysis ........................................ 55
Arguments ..................................... 56
Text of proposed declaration .................. 56
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

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

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

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

C 第二步
请记得将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

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

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

STEP 4

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入密封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格備備投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly, punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por un candidato de su selección, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfora la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfora, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請務必在投票紀錄冊上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

投票前必須選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上候選所指示候選人名打孔。如果有兩項或以上
候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上候選所指示所有候選人中，選擇你要投選的候選人打孔，但不
要超過要選舉的候選人數。

投票合適的非候選人，請在非候選人選票信封所指示的候選人上標下該候選人
所選選的職位和候選的姓名。

投票合適的候選人，請在選票上候選所指示 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有顯著打孔或破損，選票作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯誤了，請撕掉或剪掉；或撕裂了、撕裂了非候選侯選人的選票信封，應
把該選票送至選舉區的監選員，另發取一的選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Secretaries of State</th>
<th>Lieutenant Governors</th>
<th>Party Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Arthur (Mike) Hirt</td>
<td>Jacob &quot;Jay&quot; Margosian</td>
<td>Marz Garcia</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Duffy</td>
<td>Carol Hallett</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George &quot;Duke&quot; Deukmejian</td>
<td>William H.R. &quot;Bill&quot; Clark</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Curb</td>
<td>James C. Mansfield</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting Instructions:
- Vote for One (Vote per line)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republican Party</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote per Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controller</strong></td>
<td>OLLIE SPERAW</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator-Businessman</td>
<td>加州參議員－商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senator Estatal-Comerciante</td>
<td>官員代表－商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUMAN CAMPBELL</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney-Businessman</td>
<td>律師－商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado-Comerciante</td>
<td>律師－商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM E. &quot;BILL&quot; COOMBS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPA/Attorney/Businessman</td>
<td>持證公共會計師，律師，商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPA/Abogado/Comerciante</td>
<td>持證公共會計師，律師，商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES A. WARE</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Executive</td>
<td>商業總經理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ejecutivo de Comercio</td>
<td>商業總經理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LARRY LEE BALE</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Orange County Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>橙縣資源保護區主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Distrito de Conservacion de Recursos del Condado de Orange</td>
<td>橙縣資源保護區主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td>律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
<td>PHIL KAZANJIAN</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Attorney</td>
<td>公司司庫／律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero Corporativo/Abogado</td>
<td>公司司庫／律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer</td>
<td>公司司庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>公司司庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES STIERINGER</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer</td>
<td>公司司庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>公司司庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENT LLOYD</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Undersecretary-Education</td>
<td>教育部副下級主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegado Subsecretario-Educacion</td>
<td>教育部副下級主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE STIRLING</td>
<td>Attorney/Businessman/Legislator/Abogado/Comerciante/Legislator</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Asistente Decano Procurador de Justicia</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. &quot;BILL&quot; IVERS</td>
<td>State Assemblyman/Businessman/Asambleista Estatal/Comerciante</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAINE W. DONALDSON</td>
<td>Business Owner/Controller/Dueña de Negocios-Controlador</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVER W. WRIGHT</td>
<td>Hotel General Manager/Gerente General de Hotel</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE H. ADAMS JR.</td>
<td>Equalization Board Auditor/Auditor del Consejo de Igualamiento</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO BAGDONAS</td>
<td>State Board Auditor/Auditor del Consejo del Estado</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN E. REAGAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. &quot;JACK&quot; HICKEY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED BRUINSMA</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. BOOHER</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. &quot;PETE&quot; McCLOSKEY JR.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON P. McDANIELS</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN G. SCHMITZ</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM SHOCKLEY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL &quot;RALPH&quot; D. CORTES</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. (BOB) DORNAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY GOLDWATER JR.</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ELECTION PRIMARIA DE JUNIO DE 1962*
Representative in Congress – 5th District
Diputado al Congress – Distrito #5
國會眾議員 第五議區

TOM SPINOSA
Controller
Contralor 審計官

MILTON MARKS
State Senator, 5th District
Senador Estatal, Distrito #5 加州參議員 第五議區

Member of the Assembly – 19th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea – Distrito #19
加州衆議員 第十九議區

LES KELTING
Businessman-Taxpayers Advocate
Comerciante/Defensor del Contribuyente 商人/納稅人提倡者

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN SULLIVAN</td>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Mercadeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>State Central Committeeman</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro del Comité Estatal Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN R. COTTON</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seguros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLIE DANCH</td>
<td>State Central Committeewoman</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miembro del Comité Estatal Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUANITA G. RAVEN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOROTHY VUKSICH</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY A. HERPE</td>
<td>Industrial Firm President</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidente de Firma Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>Attorney-at-Law</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT C. ELKUS</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS EDWARD McGRATH</td>
<td>Loan Officer</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agente de Préstamos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9
### Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9

**Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior**  
Daniel H. Weinstein  
Vote for One  

Daniel H. Weinstein  
Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior  
185 ↔

## Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1
### Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1

**Judge of the Municipal Court/Juez de la Corte Municipal**  
Alfred G. Chiantelli  
Vote for One  

Alfred G. Chiantelli  
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal  
188 ↔

## Superintendent of Public Instruction
### Superintendente de Instrucción Pública

**Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública**  
Wilson Riles  
Vote for One  

Wilson Riles  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública  
194 ↔

## Assessor
### Asesor

**Assessor**  
Sam Duca  
Vote for One  

Sam Duca  
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo  
205 ↔

## Public Defender
### Defensor Público

**Public Defender**  
Jeff Brown  
Vote for One  

Jeff Brown  
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo  
208 ↔

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
# MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS
## STATE PROPOSITIONS

1. **NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT.** Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.
   - **FOR:** 212
   - **AGAINST:** 213

2. **PRESIDENT OF SENATE.** Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.
   - **YES:** 215
   - **NO:** 216

3. **TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION.** Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.
   - **YES:** 219
   - **NO:** 220

4. **BAIL.** Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.
   - **YES:** 223
   - **NO:** 224

5. **GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Propponent Miller).** Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.
   - **YES:** 228
   - **NO:** 229

6. **GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Propponent Rogers).** Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.
   - **YES:** 232
   - **NO:** 233

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
PROPÓSITOS ESTATALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. El gobernador ha solicitado que se utilicen los fondos de los bonos para construir nuevas prisiones en el estado.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición Constitucional en el que el Vicegerente sea Presidente del Senado, Impacto fiscal: Ninguno. Impacto directo estatal o local: Ninguno.

3. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS, VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Endurece la definición de "cambio de dueño" para excluir exenciones de propiedad tiempo por gravedad o deterioro, impuesto fiscal: Incremento de los impuestos que afectan la propiedad y aumentan en los costos administrativos para gobernar locales. Incremento en los costos estatales al proporcionar exenciones compensatorias a los distritos escolares locales y de colegios de la comunidad. Aumento en los resultados estatales del impuesto a la renta debido a defunciones mas bajas del impuesto a la propiedad.

4. FIANZA. Prohibe el libramiento de fianzas cuando la cuenta tiene un saldo de investigación relacionado con la probabilidad de que el locutor pueda no libertar a la persona detenida. Impacto fiscal: Aumento en el costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelamiento y audiencias judiciales para fianza.


Tejiendo Deuda Publica: Debido a la creación de nuevas prisiones, se requieren fondos adicionales para su construcción. El gobernador ha solicitado el uso de los fondos de los bonos para esta propuesta.

Presidencia del Senado: Revoca la disposición que otorgue al Vicegerente el papel de Presidente del Senado, evitando cualquier impacto fiscal o directo en el estatal o local.

Fijación de Impuestos: Incrementa los impuestos sobre la propiedad, aumentando los costos administrativos para gobernar locales. También, proporciona exenciones compensatorias a los distritos escolares y colegios de la comunidad, aumentando los costos estatales.

Fianza: Prohibe el libramiento de fianzas para cuentas con saldos de investigación, aumentando el costo para los gobiernos locales.

Impuestos a Donaciones y Herencias: Revoca los impuestos vigentes, recuperando el crédito federal. Reduce los impuestos estatales en cantidades significativas año a año, disminuyendo los costos administrativos.

Impuestos a las Pagas Estatales: Revoca los impuestos vigentes, reduciendo los costos administrativos.

新監獄建设公債案

新監獄建设公債案

新監獄建设公債案

新監獄建设公債案
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes Votes</th>
<th>No Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</td>
<td>Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 237</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE.</td>
<td>Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.</td>
<td>YES 241</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL.</td>
<td>“Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.</td>
<td>YES 246</td>
<td>NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.</td>
<td>“Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.</td>
<td>YES 250</td>
<td>NO 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS.</td>
<td>“Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS.</td>
<td>“Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
CIDUD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION PRIMARIA—6 DE JUNIO DE 1982

三藩市縣地方普選
初選　一九八二年六月八日

所得税指数调整 创制法案 設定增減使用物
價指數百分率 為調整個人所得稅進稅額的基
礎。財政上所受影響 加州稅收在一九八二
及八三年約減少二百三十二千元。一九八三一八四
年約少四億四千五百萬元。以後年年減少遞增。
加州政府稅收如有減少 萬 其補助地方政府與學
校的經費亦相應減少。

司法審判 修改憲法及制定法規 處理訴訟程
序、判決、釋放被告與定罪犯 及有關受害人
事件。財政上的影響 加州與地方政府所受耗
費巨大 難於確定其程度。

水利設備包括外週運河 投“是”票即贊成,
投“否”票即反對。一項法律規定中央流域計
劃增加水利設備。財政上的影響: 照目前政策
施工 加州政府不需加税 亦無須削減加州其
他計劃的開支。已核准的計劃建築費照一九八
年物價計算 會超過三千二億元 但用戶收
費增加 可以償補。

重新劃分聯邦參議區 投“是”票即贊成,
投“否”票即反對。一九八一年斷定的法規採用
四十五個國會參議區的界線。財政上的影響;
如獲通過 加州與地方政府無花費。如遭反
對 加州政府须費用二十五萬元 縣政府耗
費三十五萬元。

重新劃分加州眾議區 投“是”票即贊成,
投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會制定
—法令 改訂八十個參議區的界線。財政上
的影響 如獲通過 加州與地方政府無花費。如
遭否決 加州政府須費用三十萬 縣政府耗
費六十五萬元。
### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contributions of the city?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**

**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA—8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

MÉTODOS SOMETIDOS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES
CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a recoger en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?

267 SI 贊成
268 NO 反對

¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que lleve a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decisión o especial por medio del correo?

271 SI 贊成
272 NO 反對

¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan del estado para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución premeditada de los diez centavos del estado que tengan la población más grande?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反對

¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los cóyayes sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反對

¿Se deberá permitir al cóyaye sobreviviente de un empleado del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al cierre de sus 65 años de edad?

281 SI 贊成
282 NO 反對

¿Debería llevarse a cabo una investigación de actuario y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el aval de la Junta de Supervisores a cabo por la menos cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar las diversas pensiones para inversiones sujetas a los poderes de revisión del Controller?
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PRIMARY ELECTION – JUNE 8, 1982

H  Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors? 
YES 288  →  NO 289  →

I  Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted? 
YES 292  →  NO 293  →

J  Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure? 
YES 296  →  NO 297  →

K  Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure? 
YES 300  →  NO 301  →

L  Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board? 
YES 303  →  NO 304  →

M  Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel? 
YES 307  →  NO 308  →

N  Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions? 
YES 310  →  NO 311  →

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION PRIMARIA—8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

288 SI 贊成
289 NO 反對

4. Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública al incluir dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcaldes y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de las supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?

292 SI 贊成
293 NO 反對

4. Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcaldes y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de las supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores y la designación del servicio civil del Secretario General Administrador deberá de ser eliminada?

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

4. Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar exento del Servicio Civil y permitiría a dicho Administrador designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo al solio mismo del administrador?

300 SI 贊成
301 NO 反對

4. Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un asistente legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al solio del miembro?

303 SI 贊成
304 NO 反對

4. Deberá el supervisor que recibió la mayoría de votos en la elección de supervisores en octubre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir el 8 de enero de 1983 y cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que reciba de manera del voto en la última elección de supervisores elegido deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

307 SI 贊成
308 NO 反對

4. Declaración de Política: ¿Debería la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para usuarios digitales para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir las leyes de San Francisco?

310 SI 贊成
311 NO 反對

4. Declaración de Política: ¿Se opone el gente de San Francisco a las recientes alzas de precios de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico? ¿Debería la Comisión Estatal del Servicio Público reducir los precios a cómo estaban en el 1° de diciembre de 1981 y además otros alzas?
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year
- or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.
No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.
In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party’s candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR
ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA
My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Cyril I. Magin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 273 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCloskey Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Yavutis, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erna W. Louise, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Rizzi, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Reverend John Loschiaro, Golden Gate & Parker Sts., Pres. Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shoresneit, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblenz, 15th Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Fairmer, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Ramirez, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene F. Friend, 3910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR
PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN
My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.
As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.
I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Young Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carbora Texidor Del Porrilo, 64 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2000 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. S.C.S.Y.E., Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea J. Jepson, 1334 Mission, Director of Development
Leon King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Seafarer Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Orl, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.
Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.
My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:
- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.
Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyetman; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jabe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalia Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commission
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on “A”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal govern-ment, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle encumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on county and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((herein)) above authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinabove authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six ((6)) per cent per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid.
The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, hereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish inter-est groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller’s Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hontzio
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molnar, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hontzio, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Panteihan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolan, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaynee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city's general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city's general fund.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition “F” is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition “F” will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition “F” will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition “F” is a “no-cost” Charter Amendment.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “F”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

Capítulo I. Oportunidad de Empleo

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
(Proposition H, Continued)

sident official of an insurance company, ((and)) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; ((and)) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term expire on May 15, 1987) and every five years thereafter.

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((,(c))) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((,(three members))) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((Who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.)) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((,)); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the attorney general not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of a retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager.)) Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H

Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees’ representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “H”.

Submitted by:  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.

找工作？
何須再找呢？
於六月八日選舉日
在投票站協助
公民投票！特別
需要雙語言人士
請立即往市政廳
一五五室申請。

Looking for work?
Do not look further!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿Busca trabajo?
¡No busque mas!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City’s costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

(end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on "L"

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Attillo
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Bayliss
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kell
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kenney
Elsie Kiersten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Newa Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Conklin
Margaret Conolly
Ervin Delman
Ora Dennett
Melba Dent
Annie Deutchman
Patrick Dowling
Mary grace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatouh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Glidden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Ethel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGary
Nancy McGary
Thomas McGary
Mildred Mettenon
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefani Phipps
Al Roens
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salerno
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Serea
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Claire Swoboda
Richard Szeto
James Timassi
Fritz Tohal
John Van Heusden
Alexandra Vukisch
Dorothy Vukisch
Raymond Vukisch
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borise
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Morlimer McMichael, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Ori
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Timney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City’s law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

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

“Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on "N"

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

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot

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

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PGandE has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PGandE a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PGandE has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG andE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28).

not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

((The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.))

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION C

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care)) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
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said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors, and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition thereof submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition thereof submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
County Employees’ Retirement System ((i)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members of the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons’ dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.
This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during each year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses incurred in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(b), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
(Proposition H, Continued)

sident official of an insurance company. (end) one
of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or
actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine;
(end) three members elected by the active members
of the system from among their number, and, one
member elected by the retired members of the system
from among their number. The city attorney may de-
signate, by written document filed with the board, an
assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to
act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein,
the terms of office of the members, other than the
two ex-officio members, shall be five years (one term
expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years there-
after).

Each member of the health service board shall give
bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which
shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A
vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall
be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unex-
pired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be
filled by a special election to be completed within 60
days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election
is to be held and completed within six months after
such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership
on the health service board shall be nominated by a
written nomination of 20 members filed with the
registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later
than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy oc-
curs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and
shall furnish the same to all members of the system
between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive
the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and can-
vass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar
of voters shall have the power to make such regula-
tions respecting the form, distribution and canvassing
of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy
of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal
in number to the number to be elected who receive
the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.
Not more than one employee of any one department
or office may be a member of the health service
board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amend-
ment, the retired member position herein created shall
be filled concurrently with the next regular election
for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a re-
tirement board, which is hereby created, and which
shall be the successor and have the powers and the
duties of the board of administration, the board of
trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the
board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retire-
ment board shall consist of (the president) a
member of the board of supervisors (end) appointed
by the board of supervisors for two year terms, (end)
three members) four members to be appointed by
the mayor, (and) three members elected from the active
members from among their number and one member
elected by the retired members of the retirement sys-
tem from among their number. (who shall not include
retired persons of the retirement system.) The
members appointed by the mayor shall (either) each
hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be ex-
erienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee
pension planning, or investment portfolio management,
and shall be appointed by the mayor from among
End) four persons whose names have been sub-
titted to (him) the mayor for each such appointment
by a committee consisting of two members each of
the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association
of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board
and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Com-
merce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at
any one time, more than one appointed member who
holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the
same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office
of the eight members, other than the (presi-
dent) member of the board of supervisors, shall be
five years, and the terms presently in effect for ap-
pointed and elected members shall continue to apply
proposed by, however, that the term of office of the
elected members shall expire in February in each of
the following years and every five years thereafter:
1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the
members appointed by the mayor shall expire in Fe-
bruary in each of the following years and every five
a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy
shall occur during a term of office of any member
appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unex-
pired portion of the vacated term of office shall be
filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty
(60) days following the expiration of a term of office
or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office.
However, should the affirmation committee not submit
to the mayor the required name or names within 30
days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy
with an individual who meets the qualifications
specified above without committee recommendation.
Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term
of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled
in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of
the administrative code of the city and county of San
Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving
the term of an elected retired member, the election of
a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar
of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by or-
dinance of the board of supervisors and said elected
retired member shall take office in February 1983 and
every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the
implementation of this section shall be paid from the
accumulated contributions of the city and county. The
members of the retirement board shall serve without
compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions
of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a
secretary general manager). Notwithstanding the provi-
sions of this amendment, the board positions created
herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.
(end)
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San Francisco, California 94105

☐ Enclosed is my check in the amount of $__________ for a Sustaining Membership
☐ Please send me information on how I can become involved in the Republican Party

Name_________________________________________ Day Phone______________
Address_________________________________________ Zip______________
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
   LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
   正楷書寫姓名

2. ELECTION DATE
   JUNE 8, 1982
   我現在我報名參加選舉

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIAME LA BALOTA A:
需將選票寄給本人下址：

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
   FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
   申請人簽名

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
   Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
   申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y
reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que
aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

NOTA: Un votante que se cambie antes de los 28
días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener baloto sustituto. Un votante que
se cambie antes de los 29 días anteriores
de la elección y que no se registre antes
de la fecha final para registrarse de esta
elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR’S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We refer to your sample ballot for the number order.

County Central Committee Members to be elected:

1-10

11-20

21-30

31-40

41-50

51-60

61-70

71-80

81-90

91-100

101-110

Public Defender

District Attorney

Judge, Municipal Court #1

Judge, Superior Court #9

Assemblyman

U.S. Representative

Secretary of State

Comptroller

Treasurer

Attorney General

Governor

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY

Voter Selection Coupon

Application para papeletas de votante ausente aparece en la Página 63

Application for Absentee Ballot appears on Page 63

MAILING ADDRESS

638-3417

558-3061

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

155 CITY HALL

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

JAY PATTERSON

Third Class Permit No. 4

San Francisco Call

U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

bulk rate

Career Route Presort

ELECTION DATE

day

9-12-63
Primary Election
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE_stub_of YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

C 第二步
请如图将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二絳點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP]. PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三步
请按图之選票針，由小孔內垂直插入 打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。 在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfóre la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto al nombre del candidato. Cuando hay dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfóre la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesto a los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, no superar al número de candidatos que hay de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escribe el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfóre la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfóra, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請在投票機器體上之打孔針在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知:

請選你所選舉的任何其他候選人，請在選票上新頭所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上新頭所指所有候選人中，選擇你要候選的候選人打孔，但不要超過候選人的候選人數。

選舉合併的非黨派的候選人，請在非黨派候選人選舉機器所指的候選人名打孔，並寫下候選人的名字。

選舉任何候選人，請在選票上新頭所指 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選票上若有漏著或塗抹的，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔錯了，塗抹或漏著了；或漏著了非黨派候選人的選票或寫，應把該選票遞給選舉局的監票員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

請在下頁開始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>MICHAEL ARTHUR (MIKE) HIRT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prolife Advocate/Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defensor de la Vida/Comerciante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JAMES C. MANSFIELD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Audit-Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Auditor, Consulor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>MIKE CURB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vicegovernador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H.R. “BILL” CLARK</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Electrical Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingeniero Electricista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE “DUKE” DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>MARZ GARCIA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>CAROL HALLETT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Legislator/Rancher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legisladora Estatal/Ranchera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>GORDON DUFFY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>California State Legislator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislador del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>GLENN ROSE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Business Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrador de Comercio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>JACOB “JAY” MARGOSIAN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comerciante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Election Information**

- **ELECCION PRIMARIA**
- **6 DE JUNIO DE 1962**
- **PRIMARIA ELECTION**
- **JUNE 8, 1962**

**Primary Election Information**

- **REPUBLICAN PARTY STATE**
- **SECRETARY OF STATE**
- **GOVERNOR**
- **LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**
- **SECRETARY OF STATE**
### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLLIE SPERAW</td>
<td>State Senator-Businessman Senador Estatal-Comerciante</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUMAN CAMPBELL</td>
<td>Attorney-Businessman Abogado-Comerciante</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM E. “BILL” COOMBS</td>
<td>CPA/Attorney/Businessman CPA/Abogado/Comerciante</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES A. WARE</td>
<td>Business Executive Ejecutivo de Comercio</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY LEE BALES</td>
<td>Director, Orange County Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY</td>
<td>Attorney at Law Abogado</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treasurer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL KAZANJIAN</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Attorney Tesorero Corporativo/Abogado</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES STIERINGER</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENT LLOYD</td>
<td>Deputy Undersecretary-Education Delegado Subsecretario-Educacion</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Republican Party | State | Attorney General  
|------------------|-------|----------------|
|                  |       | Procurador General  
|                  |       | 司法廳長  
|                  |       | **Vote for One**  
|                  |       | **Vote por Uno**  
|                  |       | 請選一名  
|                  |       | **Dave Stirling**  
|                  |       | Attorney/Businessman/Legislator  
|                  |       | Abogado/Comerciante/Legislar  
|                  |       | 加州州議員  
|                  |       | **57 →**  
|                  |       | **George Nicholson**  
|                  |       | Senior Assistant Attorney General  
|                  |       | Asistente Decano Procurador de Justicia  
|                  |       | 最高副司法廳長  
|                  |       | **59 →**  

| Member State Board of Equalization – 1st District  
| Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualameinto – Distrito #1  
| 加州平準局委員  
| 第一議區  
| **Vote for One**  
| **Vote por Uno**  
| 請選一名  
| **William H. “Bill” Ivers**  
| State Assemblyman/Businessman  
| Asambleista Estatal/Comerciante  
| 加州議員／商人  
| **65 →**  
| **Elaine W. Donaldson**  
| Business Owner-Controller  
| Dueña de Negocios-Controlador  
| 店主／審計官  
| **67 →**  
| **Oliver W. Wright**  
| Hotel General Manager  
| Gerente General de Hotel  
| 旅館總經理  
| **69 →**  
| **Joe H. Adams Jr.**  
| Equalization Board Auditor  
| Auditor del Consejo de Igualamiento  
| 平準局查帳員  
| **71 →**  
| **Leo Bagdonas**  
| State Board Auditor  
| Auditor del Consejo del Estado  
| 加州查帳員  
| **73 →**  

**Election Primary**  
8 de Junio de 1982  
**Primary Election**  
June 8, 1982
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON</td>
<td>Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAUREEN E. REAGAN</td>
<td>Business Executive/Ejecutiva de Comercio</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. “JACK” HICKEY</td>
<td>Research Scientist/Cientifico Encargado de Investigaciones</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. PEMBERTON</td>
<td>Behavioral Scientist/Cientifico del Comportamiento Humano</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TED BRUINSMA</td>
<td>Businessman/Law Dean/Comerciante/Decano de Derecho</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. BOOHER</td>
<td>Microelectronic Engineer/Ingeniero Microelectrico</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL N. “PETE” McCLOSKEY JR.</td>
<td>Member of Congress/Miembro del Congreso</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON P. McDANIELS</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN G. SCHMITZ</td>
<td>California State Senator/Senador del Estado de California</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM SHOCKLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL “RALPH” D. CORTES</td>
<td>Doctoral Student, UCLA/Doctorado, UCLA</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT K. (BOB) DORNAN</td>
<td>United States Congressman/Congregista Estadounidense</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY GOLDWATER JR.</td>
<td>Member of Congress/Miembro del Congreso</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress – 5th District</td>
<td>TOM SPINOSA</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator – 8th Senatorial District</td>
<td>MILTON MARKS</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly – 19th Assembly District</td>
<td>LEANNE C. GUTH</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly – 19th Assembly District</td>
<td>LES KELTING</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN SULLIVAN</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN R. COTTON</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLIE DANCH</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUANITA G. RAVEN</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOROTHY VUKSICH</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY A. HERPE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT C. ELKUS</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS EDWARD McGRATH</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERENCE FAULKNER</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nonpartisan Primary Election - June 8, 1982

#### Judicial

**Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9**  
**Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9**  
Vote for One

- **Daniel H. Weinstein**  
  Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior  
  185

**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1**  
**Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1**  
Vote for One

- **Alfred G. Chiantelli**  
  Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal  
  188
- **Patricia (Pat) Lucey**  
  Attorney/Abogada  
  189
- **Richard E. Best**  
  Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes  
  190
- **Richard Tullis**  
  Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente  
  191

#### School

**Superintendent of Public Instruction**  
**Superintendente de Instrucción Pública**  
Vote for One

- **Wilson Riles**  
  State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública  
  194
- **Janet L. Allen**  
  Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comerciante  
  195
- **Daniel Nussbaum**  
  Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico  
  196
- **Bill Honig**  
  District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar  
  197
- **Myron Lieberman**  
  School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar  
  198
- **Gene Prat**  
  Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos  
  199
- **Jeanne Baird**  
  Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos  
  200
- **Georgia Marshall**  
  Principal/Directora  
  201
- **Richard E. Ferraro**  
  Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Miembro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles  
  202

#### City & County

**Assessor**  
**Asesor**  
Vote for One

- **Sam Duca**  
  Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo  
  205

**Public Defender**  
**Defensor Público**  
Vote for One

- **Jeff Brown**  
  Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo  
  208

---

**On your voting machine this page will be green.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>NO 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>NO 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>NO 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Dispongo el uso de 495,000,000 para ser ventas en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Renuncia la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicepresidente sea Presidente del Senado. Impact fisico: Ningún impacto directo estatal o local.

3. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS, VALUACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Enmienda la definición de "camino de dos" para incluir reemplazo de propiedad tomada por procedimiento de tipo de dación en comision. Impact fiscal: Significativa pérdida de recaudación al propietario y aumento en los costos administrativos para gobiernos locales. Incremento en los costos estatales para proporcionación de asistencia compensativa a los distintos escuelas locales y de colegios de la comuna. Aumento en los réditos estatales del impuesto a la renta debido a reducciones en los hijos del impuesto a la propiedad.

4. FIANZA. Prohiba dar libertad bajo fianza cuando la carta tiene requisitos adicionales de investigación coadyuvante a la probabilidad de que la persona puesta en libertad pueda causar grave daño físico o altrui. Impact fiscal: Aumenta el costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelamiento y custodia y reduciendo la fianza para palabras. Podría haber beneficios compensatorios si la persona fuera más tarde identificada como el criminal o la prisionera.

5. IMPUESTOS A DONACIONES Y HERENCIAS (Propuesta Miller). Renuncia los impuestos sobre las herencias: "recaudar" el credito de los impuestos federales especificado. Impact fiscal: Reduce las recaudaciones estatales en una $130 millones en 1982, en una $385 millones en 1983-84 y en cantidades menores de allí en adelante. Aumenta el estatuto un $5 millones adicionales en costos administrativos. La reducción de las recaudaciones estatales resulta en reducciones correspondientes en los pagos estatales a los gobiernos locales a las escuelas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 237</td>
<td>NO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.</td>
<td>YES 241</td>
<td>NO 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.</td>
<td>YES 246</td>
<td>NO 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.</td>
<td>YES 250</td>
<td>NO 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.</td>
<td>YES 254</td>
<td>NO 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.</td>
<td>YES 258</td>
<td>NO 259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA - 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

三藩市縣地方普選
初選 - 一九八二年六月八日

所得税指数调整 创制法案 撤销数税项目物价
指数数百分率微调整数所得税渐进税的基
础。财政上数受影响 加州税收一九八二
一三年约减少二亿三千万元。一九八三一九四
年约少四亿四千五百万元。以后年年少递增,
加州政府税收如有减少, 其补助地方政府与学
校的预算亦相应减少。

JUSTICIA PENAL. Examinando la Constitución y promulgando leyes
con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y liberación de personas
acusadas y condenadas y en lo que concierne a las víctimas. Impacto fiscal:
Custas administrales y locales mayores que no pueden ser puestas sin ningún grado de
costanza.

刑案审判 修改诉讼法及制定法规 虔理诉讼程序
审判、释放被定罪罪犯 及有关受害者
事件。财政上的影响 加州地政府所有受耗
费重大 难于确定其程度。

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un
votó "Sí" aprueba, un votó "No" rechaza, una ley que designa instituciones
de usuarios de agua aditacional del Proyecto del Valle Central. Impacto fiscal:
Bajo las normas presentes, se no regularía aumento en las imposiciones
a los usufructuarios si las reducciones de los fondos destinados a otros programas
redundan en las nuevas condiciones de construcción en precios de 1961, que son
en exceso de $3,100,000,000 más las cantidades adicionales que se
descienden, serían financiadas por el incremento de la cuota a los consumidores.

水利設備包括外圍運河 投“是”票即赞成 投“否”票即反对。一项法案指定中央流域計
劃增加水利設備。财政上的影响：照目前政策
施工 加州政府不必增加亦不须削减加州其
他計劃的预算。已核准的計劃建築費照一九八
一年度計算 將超過三十七億元 但用度收
費增加 仍可補貼。

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un votó "Sí" aprueba, un
votó "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1961 que
adapta los límites para los 43 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si se
aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si se rechazado, costos al estado de
$250,000 y a los condados de $350,000.

重新劃分國會選區 投“是”票即赞成 投“否”票即反对。一九八一年制定的法規採用
四十五個國會選區的界線。財政上的影響：
如獲通過 加州地方政府無花費。如遭反
對 加州政府須耗款二十五萬 縣政府耗
款三十五萬。

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un votó "Sí" aprueba, un
votó "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1961 que
revisa los límites de los 45 distritos Senatoriales. Impacto fiscal: Si se
aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si se rechazado, costos al estado de
$370,000 y a los condados de $600,000.

重新劃分(加州)參議院 投“是”票即贊成 投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會制
定一法規 改訂四十五個參議員的界線。財政上的
影響：如獲通過 加州地方政府無花費。如遭反
對 加州政府須耗款三十七萬 縣政府耗
款五十萬。

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un votó "Sí" aprueba, un
votó "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1961 que
revisa los límites de los 80 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si se
aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si se rechazado, costos al estado de
$400,000 y a los condados de $650,000.

重新劃分(加州)眾議院 投“是”票即贊成 投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會頒佈
一法令 改訂八十個眾議員的界線。財政上的
影響：如獲通過 加州與地方政府不用花費。如
遭反對 加州政府耗款四十萬元 縣政府耗
款六十五萬元。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>largest population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contributions of the city?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Código</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá la Junta de Superintendentes tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a recurrir en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Superintendentes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Deberá la Junta de Superintendentes tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a recurrir en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Superintendentes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá permitir a la Junta de Superíndices ordenar al Registro de Electores que lleva a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, declarar a especial por medio del correo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Deberá permitir a la Junta de Superíndices ordenar al Registro de Electores que lleva a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, declarar a especial por medio del correo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los diez cientos del estado que tengan la población más grande?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los diez cientos del estado que tengan la población más grande?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los fumadores sobrevivientes de las empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los fumadores sobrevivientes de las empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá permitir el fumador sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibir dicha pensión al cuestion de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>¿Deberá permitir el fumador sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibir dicha pensión al cuestion de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuaria y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el evaluación del actuaría llevado a cabo por menos cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>¿Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuaria y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el evaluación del actuaría llevado a cabo por menos cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los días de pensión de inversiones sujeta a los poderes de reclamación del Director?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los días de pensión de inversiones sujeta a los poderes de reclamación del Director?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>¿Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública mediante dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Además, se mencionan varias declaraciones de política sobre temas como la salud pública, la ayuda a los jubilados y la función de la Junta de Supervisores.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes. The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election.
Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
SAM DUCA
My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor’s Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary’s Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors’ Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Cyril I. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Favreau, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Loo Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Louie, 1527 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellen, 310 Arbello, Exec., V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Faramin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymond, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN
My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender’s Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Fillbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carolea Tecedor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinman, 2050 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Sctly, Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea I. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Maginn, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nicco, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Ostr, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O’Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Redd, 476 Jost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.
Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.
My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanney, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:
- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Geyman; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan, I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
**Tax Anticipation Notes**

**PROPOSITION A**

Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “A”**

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

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

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

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues
The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle uncumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((hereinabove)) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year

in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which, said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per cent per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition "B" will prevent this waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition "B" will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A "YES" vote for Proposition "B" will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won't have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting "YES" for Proposition "B" will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco's taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote "YES" on Proposition "B".

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller's Statement on “C”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hungisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City’s contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.”

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees, of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by: Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Goggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Parichan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wacheb, President, District #8
Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dabon
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

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


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition “F” is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition “F” will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition “F” will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition “F” is a “no-cost,” Charter Amendment.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “F”.

Submitted by:  Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  Retirement Board of City and
County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension monies. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by:  Supervisor John L. Molinari
              Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
              Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
              Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
              Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  Retirement Board of City and
              County of San Francisco
              Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees’ representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “H”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
PROPOSITION I

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?

That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT

James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J
The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:
1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties
The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary
The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors’ Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City’s costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmer,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Bob Guichard
George Rehmer, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aielo
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylouc
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borghet
Mary Anne Brennan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
AI Barwise
George Erkanovich, Union official
Marsha Putzes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Morstimer McInermey, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendt Nelder
Bernie Orsi
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940’s that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.
Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a renegeing. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M
Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED
Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
P.G. & E. Rates

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
P.G. & E. Rates

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG and E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by (double parenthesis).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.
In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.
Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.
The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.
All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.
In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fee schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until approved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.
Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such funds or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors, and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.
(Proposition D, Continued)

County Employees' Retirement System ((c)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System, and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (*end*)

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations

The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (*end*)

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

3.680 Board Composition

The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)): the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership
on the health service board shall be nominated by a
written nomination of 20 members filed with the
registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later
than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy oc-
curs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and
shall furnish the same to all members of the system
between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive
the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and can-
vass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar
of voters shall have the power to make such regulat-
ions respecting the form, distribution and canvassing
of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy
of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal
in number to the number to be elected who receive
the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.
Not more than one employee of any one department
or office may be a member of the health service
board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amend-
ment, the retired member position herein created shall
be filled concurrently with the next regular election
for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION 1

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a re-
tirement board, which is hereby created, and which
shall be the successor and have the powers and the
duties of the board of administration, the board of
trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the
board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retire-
ment board shall consist of ((the president)) a
member of the board of supervisors (cis) appointed
by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three
members)) four members to be appointed by the
mayor, (and)) three members elected from the active
members from among their number and one member
elected by the retired members of the retirement
system from among their number. ((who shall not include
retired persons of the retirement system.) The members
appointed by the mayor shall (either)) each
hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be ex-
perienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee
pension planning, or investment portfolio management,
and shall be appointed by the mayor from among
((three)) four persons whose names shall have been
submitted to ((him)) the mayor for such appoint-
ment by a committee consisting of two members each
of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association
of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board
and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Com-
merce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at
any one time, more than one appointed member who
holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the
same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office
of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((presi-
dent)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be
five years, and the terms presently in effect for ap-
pointed and elected members shall continue to apply
((cis)); provided, however, that the term of office of
the elected members shall expire in February in each of
the following years and every five years thereafter:
1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the
members appointed by the mayor shall expire in Fe-
buary in each of the following years and every five
a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy
shall occur during a term of office of any member ap-
pointed by the mayor, the term of office or unex-
pired portion of the vacated term of office shall be
filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty
(60) days following the expiration of a term of office
or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office.
However, should the affirmation committee not submit
to the mayor the required name or names within 30
days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy
with an individual who meets the qualifications
specified above without committee recommendation.
Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of
an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled
in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of
the administrative code of the city and county of San
Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving
the term of an elected retired member, the election of
a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar
of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by or-
dinance of the board of supervisors and said elected
retired member shall take office in February 1983 and
every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in
the implementation of this section shall be paid from the
accumulated contributions of the city and county.
The members of the retirement board shall serve without
compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions
of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a
secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provi-
sions of this amendment, the board positions created
herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, mete la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手持票向自動機将整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

C 第二步
請如記將選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三步
请把标针之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入有孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格可備為投票人應用。
STEP ONE

(Instructions for American Independent, Peace & Freedom and Libertarian voters ONLY)

1. Make your choice from the sample ballot you will receive at the polls.

   ![Sample Ballot Diagram]

2. Using the wire pin clipped to your ballot card, punch out dot on the ballot card over the number of your choice for candidate or "YES" or "NO" on measures.

   Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.

3. After voting the partisan portion of your ballot, place the ballot card into the machine and continue voting on the green pages.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

A 第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Para 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con los dos capuchetas rojas.

C 第二步
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Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

STEP 4

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾露出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTERS REGISTERED IN THE FOLLOWING POLITICAL PARTIES:
LIBERTARIAN PARTY
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Your ballot is divided into two parts:

1. The PARTISAN portion, which contains the candidates of your party. Only members of your party may vote on these.

2. The NONPARTISAN portion, which contains propositions, judges, etc. on which everyone is entitled to vote.

   **Step One**

   In voting the partisan portion of your ballot you will be given a paper “sample ballot” with the names and punch position numbers of your party’s candidates.

   Taking the punchcard ballot and the paper “sample ballot” into one of the booths.

   Place your ballot on top of the styrofoam board.

   Using the small blue stylus needle in the booth, punch out the numbers on the punchcard ballot corresponding to your choice of party candidates.

   **Step Two**

   Now you are ready to vote the nonpartisan portion of your ballot.

   Take your punchcard ballot and insert it into the voting machine as shown on page 6. **VOTE ONLY ON THE GREEN PAGES** of the voting machine. Ignore the white pages; the white pages of the machine are applicable only to one of the other political parties, not yours.

   If you try to vote the white pages on the voting machine the computer will ignore any votes cast on the white pages (your votes on the green pages of the voting machine will be counted no matter what).

   **REMEMBER:**

   • Vote the partisan portion of your ballot by using the paper “sample ballot” and poking out the appropriate numbers on your ballot card.

   • Vote the nonpartisan portion by inserting your card in the voting machine and using the GREEN pages ONLY.

   • Ignore the white pages on the voting machine.

   If you make a mistake the poll workers will give you a fresh ballot if you ask for it.

   Before returning your voted ballot, make sure there are no little paper chips hanging from the back side of your ballot.

   To determine which political party you are registered with, please refer to the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party code is printed directly above your name. “P+F” means Peace & Freedom, “LBN” means Libertarian and “AIP” means American Independent Party.

   **NOTICE**

   If you are registered as a member of the Libertarian, Peace & Freedom or American Independent parties you will be receiving the partisan portion of your sample ballot in the mail in a few days.

   The nonpartisan portion of your ballot appears on the following pages.
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR NONPARTISAN VOTERS

On election day you will be voting in booths set up for Republicans and Democrats.

Nonpartisan voters are eligible to vote only on propositions and on candidates for nonpartisan offices such as Judge, Superintendent of Public Instruction, etc. These propositions and candidates are all contained in the green pages of the voting machine.

After you sign in at your precinct you will be given a tan ballot card. Take the card into the voting booth and insert it into the voting machine as shown in the instructions on page 6.

Then turn to the green pages on the voting machine. Vote only the green pages and ignore the white pages of the voting machine.

To find out if you are a nonpartisan voter, please refer to the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. The letters "N/P" above your name indicate nonpartisan voter.
Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their party.

Your party needs your support. Both money and volunteers are needed in the campaign. The address and phone number of your party are printed below:

LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Send contributions to:

Libertarian Party Headquarters
1800 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94102

For information on the Libertarian Party, call 864-0952 or visit the Libertarian Bookstore at 1800 Market Street.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Send contributions to:

American Independent Party
64 Joost Street
San Francisco, California 94131

For information on the American Independent Party call 587-9636.

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY

Send contributions to:

Peace & Freedom Party
459 Ellis Street #250
San Francisco, California 94102
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LÁPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borraduras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

請用附在投票紀錄冊上的針孔在選票上打孔；千萬不要用鋼筆或鉛筆。

選民須知：

投票時所選擇的任何其他候選人，請在選票上選票所指之候選人名打孔。如果有兩或以上
候選人做同一職位，請在選票上選票所指之所有候選人中，選擇您要投票的候選人打孔，但不
要超過選票所指定的數量。

投票前後，候選人選票所指之「YES」或「NO」字樣打孔。

選票上如有圖案或非法標記，選票即作廢。

如果你在選票上打孔了（觀眾或選票了），選票棄了（選票了所有候選人選票何選？）將
把該選票還原至選票冊，另取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>office</th>
<th>candidates</th>
<th>vote counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI Juez de la Corte Municipal</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD Educacional Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONG</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS
STATE PROPOSITIONS

1 NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.

FOR 212
AGAINST 213

2 PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.

YES 215
NO 216

3 TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 219
NO 220

4 BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.

YES 223
NO 224

5 GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state "pickup" estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

YES 228
NO 229

6 GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state "pickup" estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

YES 232
NO 233

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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PROPOSICIONES ESTATUALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Disponen emisión de bonos por $465,000,000 para su adecuación con la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Resuelve la disputa Constitucional de que el Vicesecretario es Presidente del Senado, impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estatal local.

3. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Continúa la limitación de la "cántiga de peso" para ayudar el desarrollo de propiedad ganado por gobernador de la ley fiscal. La aplicación de la tasa estándar para denominar la tasa de propietario, incremento en la tasa de impuestos. Impacto en el valor de la propiedad local de la comunidad. Impacto en el banco estatal local de la comunidad. Impacto en el banco estatal local de la comunidad.

4. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Continúa la limitación de la "cántiga de peso" para ayudar el desarrollo de propiedad ganado por gobernador de la ley fiscal. La aplicación de la tasa estándar para denominar la tasa de propietario, incremento en la tasa de impuestos. Impacto en el valor de la propiedad local de la comunidad. Impacto en el banco estatal local de la comunidad.

5. IMPUESTOS A DONACIONES Y HERENCIA (Propuesta Millon). Resuelve las impuestos vigentes. Vuelta a disminuir el impuesto estadual "recabar" al común beneficiario igual al crédito de impuesto federal especificado, impacto fiscal: Reduces el umbral legal en pesos $130 millones en 1983-84, en pesos $335 millones en 1984-85 y en cantidades menores de allí en adelante. Abre el crédito invisible en cantidades menores al crédito administrativo. La reducción en los impuestos legales resultará en reducciones correspondientes en las pagas estatales a los gobiernos locales y a los escuelas.


INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTADO DE INICIATIVA. Establece un reajuste conforme a los avances del impuesto a la renta personal usando los cambios en la perspectiva de los flujos de efectivo de los fondos del Contralor del Condado. (Impuesto Fiscal: Reducir los reajustes anuales a un 80% de la base, equivalentes a un 5% de los fondos, en los años 1988-89; en un 4% en 1989-90; en un 1% en 1990.) En las bases estatales y locales las reducciones corresponden a los gastos estatales y escuelas locales.

JUSTICIA PENAL. Enmienda la Constitución y promulga estatutos con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y libertar para personas acusadas y condenadas y en lo que concierne a las víctimas, Impuesto Fiscal; Costas estatales y locales mayores que no pueda ser provisoria con ninguna grada de certeza.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PENIFERICO. Un voto "Sí" aprobaría, un voto "No" rechaza, una ley que reubica las instalaciones hidráulicas de agua adicionales del Proyecto del Valle Central, Impuesto Fiscal. Haga lo necesario presente en los impuestos estatales al reducción de los fondos destinados a otros programas estatales. Los pilotos rectif ios de construcción en granos de 1981, que son en exceso de $5,100,000,000 más las cantidades adicionales que se descubran, será financiado por el incremento del costo a los consumidores.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que reubica los límites para los 45 distritos Congresionales, Impuesto Fiscal; Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si es rechazado, costas el estado de $255,000 y a las condados de $350,000.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DISTRITS SENATORIALES. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que reubica los límites de los 30 distritos Senatoriales, Impuesto Fiscal; Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si es rechazado, costas el estado de $370,000 y a las condados de $400,000.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN. DIRECCION DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que reubica los límites de los 20 distritos de la Asamblea, Impuesto Fiscal; Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si es rechazado, costas el estado de $400,000 y a las condados de $550,000.

Fiscalía de la Revolución: 1. "Sí" aprueba, 1. "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que reubica los límites de los 10 distritos de la Fiscalía. Impuesto Fiscal; Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si es rechazado, costas el estado de $150,000 y a las condados de $200,000.

Fiscalía de la Revolución: 2. "Sí" aprueba, 2. "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que reubica los límites de los 10 distritos de la Fiscalía. Impuesto Fiscal; Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si es rechazado, costas el estado de $150,000 y a las condados de $200,000.

Fiscalía de la Revolución: 3. "Sí" aprueba, 3. "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que reubica los límites de los 10 distritos de la Fiscalía. Impuesto Fiscal; Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal a local. Si es rechazado, costas el estado de $150,000 y a las condados de $200,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Detalles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Superintendentes tomar el poder de quitar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a recoger en la manera establecida por la ley estatal y negar el derecho a la Junta de Superintendentes?</td>
<td>- Para los ciudadanos con el derecho de voto.</td>
<td>- No se especifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Debería permitir a la Junta de Superintendentes ordenar el Registro de Electores que llave a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decidiendo a especlitar por medio del correo?</td>
<td>- Es para definir el procedimiento para las elecciones municipales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para las amparadas de la ciudad que necesitan una contribución promedio de los días corridos del estado que tengo la población más grande?</td>
<td>- Para la ciudadanía receptora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a los cóyugues subventionales de los socios subventionales del sistema de la Junta de Superintendentes?</td>
<td>- Para los socios subventionales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Debería permitir el cóyuge subventónico de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión a cuenta de nuevo después de los 65 años de edad?</td>
<td>- Para los pensionados.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Debería llevar a cabo investigaciones de actuar de y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinada por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el análisis del actuaría llevado a cabo por la misma cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
<td>- Para el análisis del sistema de Jubilaciones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva para administrar los diferentes beneficios para jubilados sujetos a la potestad de revisión del Director?</td>
<td>- Para la Junta de Jubilaciones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 286</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 289</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 292</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 293</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 296</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 297</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 300</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 301</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 303</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 304</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 307</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 308</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES 310</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO 311</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**

**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION PRIMARIA – 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

三藩市縣地方普選
初選 - 一九八二年六月八日

288 SI 贊成
289 NO 反對

¿Deberá cambiar el escenario de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Públicas eliminando dos miembros, nos a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los superiores a ser designado por la Junta de Superiores?

292 SI 贊成
293 NO 反對

¿Deberá cambiar el escenario de la Junta de Jubilaciones eliminando dos miembros, nos a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los superiores a ser designado por la Junta de Superiores y la designación del secretario civil del Secretario General Administrador deberá ser eliminado?

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

¿Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar auxiliado por el Servicio Civil y ser eliminado de dicho Administrador designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo al atajo del administrador?

300 SI 贊成
301 NO 反對

¿Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Superiores designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevara a cabo sus funciones en el atajo del miembro?

303 SI 贊成
304 NO 反對

¿Deberá el suplente que recibió la mayoría de votos en la elección de superiores de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 5 de enero de 1983 y cada agrega año a partir de ese año el candidato que recibió la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de superiores designado deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

307 SI 贊成
308 NO 反對

Declaración de Política: ¿Deberá la ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir nuevos computadores para cuentas digitales para el uso del personal encargado de hacer Complleight y la Ley de San Francisco?

310 SI 贊成
311 NO 反對

Declaración de Política: ¿Deberá el gobernador de San Francisco a los recientes atrasos de protocolos de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico I recomendar enfáticamente que la Comisión Estatal de Servicio Público reduzca los precios a como estaban el 1° de diciembre de 1981 y además pedir otros cambios?
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don't tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party's choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters' Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters' handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year
- or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar's Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q.—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A.—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q.—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A.—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q.—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A.—Yes.

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

Q.—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A.—Yes.

Q.—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A.—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q.—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A.—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

THE RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCAN

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril I. Maguin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member of Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Faves, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4002-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Estela, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Louet, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Walter H. Shorein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Ruddin, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Cobletz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Farnam, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymond, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Makovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4002 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagai, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 850 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carola Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Estela, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinsteinv, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1056 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fris, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Sec'ty, Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea I. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Manzucato, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Ozzi, 500 Magellans, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hattie Redd, 476 Jost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.

23
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanzy, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

• Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
• Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
• Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Geymant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

---

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE  
Office Number 1  
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years 
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court 
Commissioner 
My education and qualifications are: Columbia Uni-
versity School of Law, 1968; five years private law 
practice; eight years judicial experience; married. two 
children, residing at 142 Cervantes. 
As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the 
Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex 
civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lec-
tured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal 
publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. 
In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club 
award for exemplary contribution to legal education. 

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent 
application of law, protection of the innocent, and 
punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure 
at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection 
of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal 
justice under law. 

My supporters include John A. Sutro, Putnam Livermore, 
Harold Dobbs, George J. Moscone. Assemblyman Art Ag-
nos, Tina Burgess Coan, Ed Turner, James Lee, Rita Alviar, 
Lorraine Wiles, Sheriff Michael Hennessy, Thomas A. Reed, 
S.F., John E. Sullivan, Jane McKaskle Murphy, Morris 
Bernstein, George Evankovich, George Wong, Mrs. Alessan-
dro Baccari, Sr., Margarette Warren, William T. Reed, 
Graciela Cashion, Ina Dearman, Libby Denebeim, Jesse 
Judith Breckin, Terry Francois, Melvin Belli, Charles Ren-
frew, Edward I. Reidy.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE  
Office Number 1  
ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42 
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney 
My education and qualifications are: A native San 
Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and 
USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln 
University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 
1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and 
criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was 
appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and 
taught at local law schools. Having served under three 
District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My 
court experience includes more than 125 jury trials 
and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, 
appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court 
and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the 
last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense at-
torneys, members of law enforcement and a broad 
cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in sever-
al civic organizations. 

Sponsors: William Moskovitz, Vincent Hallinan, Thomas 
Mellon, Jeff Brown, Thomas J. Cahill, Ephraim Margolin, 
John F. Henning Jr., John J. Moylan, Gordon Armstrong, 
Dorothy Casper, Eduardo Sandoval, J.A. Scatena, Stephen L. 
Swig, Gordon Lau, Henry E. Berman, Ernest C. Ayala, 
Thomas E. Horn, Roger S. Lalane, Dorothy Stern; Judges 
John B. Molinari, Francis McCarty, Mary Moran Pajalich, 
Samuel E. Yee, Raymond Reynolds, Albert A. Axlerod.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION “A".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((hereinabove)) authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year

in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness, for the benefit of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per cent per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition "B" will prevent this waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by:

Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method ofballoting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarpump savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

Submit by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits. Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco. The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Keasley, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Giggo, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Farichand, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wochob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee’s surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee’s spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by:  Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Harry G. Britt  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Wendy Nelder  
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  Jaycee N. Ford, President  
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee  
William T. Reed, Coordinator  
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress  
(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by:  Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章: 工作良機

你可以在 六月八日 三藩市選舉日工作。特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘。在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票，請往市政廳（濱街交高街）一五五室申請。
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Leo S. Dobson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “1”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT

James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissive for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties
The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary
The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

(end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisory election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller's Statement on "L"

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That’s why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keoghan
Marion Kelly
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elsie Kuersten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montano
Irene Moresko
Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concklin
Margarette Connolly
Ervin Delman
Ona Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Deutscherman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunn
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatouh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladson
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hu

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter’s designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON’T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbarigata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Huther
Joseph Huter, Union official
Mortimer McNerney, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Benji Ortiz
Lester O’Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Timney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARter AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

(The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don't just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don't have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated that it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultra-modern "tools" they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

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

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PGandE has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PGandE a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PGandE has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG andE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Swaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with

57
(Proposition C, Continued) said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such funds or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors((c)), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System.
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System ((c)), and the
surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviv-
ing spouse of a retired employee, provided that the
surviving spouse and the active or retired employee
have been married for a period of at least one year
prior to the death of the active or retired employee.
The city and county, the school district and the
community college district shall each contribute to the
health service fund amounts sufficient for the follow-
ing purposes, and subject to the following limitations:
(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the
health service system.
(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973,
the city and county, the school district and the com-
munity college district shall contribute to the health
service system fund with respect to each of their
members an amount equal to one-half of the average
contribution,” as certified by the health service board
in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute to the health service system fund with respect
to each of their members an amount equal to “the
average contribution,” as certified by the health ser-
vice board in accordance with the provisions of sec-
tion 8.423.
(c) Monthly contributions required from retired per-
sons and the surviving spouses of active employees and
retired persons participating in the system shall be
equal to the monthly contributions required from
members in the system, except that the total contribu-
tions required from retired persons who are also
covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an
amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by
such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each
fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost
to the system in providing the same health coverage
to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active
employees and retired persons as is provided for active
employee members.
(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified
School District and the San Francisco Community
College District shall not contribute to the health ser-
vice system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set
forth, on account of participation in the benefits of
the system by members' dependents except surviving
spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving
spouses, persons who retired and elected not to
receive benefits from San Francisco City and County
Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees
and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any em-
ployee whose compensation is fixed in accordance
with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter
and whose compensation therein includes an additional
amount for health and welfare benefits or whose
health service costs are reimbursed through any fund
established for said purpose by ordinance of the
board of supervisors.
It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the
board of education and the governing board of the
community college district annually to appropriate to
the health service system fund such amounts as are
necessary to cover the respective obligations of the
city and county, the San Francisco Unified School
District and San Francisco Community College Dis-
trict hereby imposed. Contributions to the health ser-
vice system fund of the city and county, of the school
district and of the community college district shall be
charged against the general fund or the school, utility,
bond or other special fund concerned.
The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.
The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.
If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more
propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter
receive the number of votes necessary for their adopt-
ton, notwithstanding any other provision of this
charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provi-
sions into one section. (end)
NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(b), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-60 expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
(Proposition H, Continued)

sident official of an insurance company, (and,) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; (and,) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years (one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years thereafter.

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors (or) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, (((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, (and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. (who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among (((three)) four persons whose names have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the (six) eight members, other than the (president) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply (and), provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office of unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager.) Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.

(end)
Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their party.

Your party needs your support. Both money and volunteers are needed in the campaign. The address and phone number of your party are printed below:

**LIBERTARIAN PARTY**

Send contributions to:

Libertarian Party Headquarters  
1800 Market Street  
San Francisco, California 94102

For information on the Libertarian Party, call 864-0952 or visit the Libertarian Bookstore at 1800 Market Street.

**AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY**

Send contributions to:

American Independent Party  
64 Joost Street  
San Francisco, California 94131

For information on the American Independent Party call 587-9636.

**PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY**

Send contributions to:

Peace & Freedom Party  
459 Ellis Street #250  
San Francisco, California 94102
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE ABSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETRAS DE IMPRENTA Application must also be signed below by applicant. Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE June 8, 1982
I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIEME LA BALOTA A:

DATE: ____________________________
FECHA: ____________________________

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

I prefer election materials in English
☐ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
☐ 我欲索取中文選舉資料

If you have moved, complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

If you have moved
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ____________________________ 19.
My residence address is ____________________________________________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 28 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 28 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

DATE: ____________________________
FECHA: ____________________________

Zip Code
Código Postal

5. My address is ____________________________________________________________

MAKE TO:
ENVÍAR A:
REGISTRAR DE VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 6:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS 6:00 DE LA TARDE, MARTES 1, JUNIO,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Candidate A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Candidate B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Candidate C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wheelchair Accessibility:**

Yes

**Voter Selection Coupon**

**Application for Absentee Ballot Appearance on Page 63**

**Address:**

558-3417
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691

**Election Date:**

558-3061
155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691

**Registration of Voters:**

Jay Patterson
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet

Primary Election
June 8, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 4

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#—Area EAST of (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters
# Voter Information Pamphlet

## General Information
- Your Rights As a Voter: 20
- Words You Need to Know: 22
- Absentee Ballot Application: 63
- Location of Your Polling Place: 64
- Voter Selection Coupon: 64
- Voting Instructions: 3
- SAMPLE BALLOT: 5

## Candidates for Judge
- Richard E. Best: 23
- Alfred G. Chiantelli: 23
- Patricia (Pat) Lucey: 24
- Richard Tullis: 24

## Candidates for Public Defender
- Jeff Brown: 25

## Candidates for Assessor
- Sam Duca: 25

## Propositions

### Proposition A
Removes some of the restrictions in issuance of tax anticipation notes.
- Analysis: 26
- Arguments: 27
- Text of proposed law: 28, 57

### Proposition B
Allows Supervisors the option of conducting a local election by mail.
- Analysis: 29
- Arguments: 30, 31
- Text of proposed law: 57

### Proposition C
Establishes a dental plan for City employees.
- Analysis: 32
- Argument: 33
- Text of proposed law: 57, 58

### Proposition D
Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
- Analysis: 34
- Argument: 35
- Text of proposed law: 58, 59

### Proposition E
Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.
- Analysis: 36
- Argument: 37
- Text of proposed law: 60

### Proposition F
Establishes procedural and bookkeeping changes in the City's retirement system.
- Analysis: 38
- Argument: 39
- Text of proposed law: 60

### Proposition G
Gives the Retirement Board exclusive jurisdiction over investment of pension funds.
- Analysis: 40
- Argument: 41
- Text of proposed law: 41

### Proposition H
Changes the composition of the Health Service Board.
- Analysis: 42
- Argument: 43
- Text of proposed law: 60, 61

### Proposition I
Changes the composition of the Retirement Board and removes Manager from Civil Service.
- Analysis: 44
- Argument: 45
- Text of proposed law: 61

### Proposition J
Two Retirement System administrators to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
- Analysis: 46
- Argument: 47
- Text of proposed law: 47

### Proposition K
Supervisors' legislative aides to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
- Analysis: 48
- Argument: 49
- Text of proposed law: 49

### Proposition L
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1
Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

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

D 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

D 第二步
请切记将票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合与二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE, DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三步
请把带针之选票针，由小孔内垂直插入
打孔投票。

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

STEP 4

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

D 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
STEP ONE

(INSTRUCTIONS FOR AMERICAN INDEPENDENT, PEACE & FREEDOM AND LIBERTARIAN VOTERS ONLY)

1. Make your choice from the sample ballot you will receive at the polls.

2. Using the wire pin clipped to your ballot card, punch out dot on the ballot card over the number of your choice for candidate or "YES" or "NO" on measures.

3. After voting the partisan portion of your ballot, place the ballot card into the machine and continue voting on the green pages.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.
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USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
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请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.
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HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.
Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfure con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把帶鉚之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

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

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備爲投棄票人應用。
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTERS REGISTERED IN THE FOLLOWING POLITICAL PARTIES:
LIBERTARIAN PARTY
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Your ballot is divided into two parts:

1. The PARTISAN portion, which contains the candidates of your party. Only members of your party may vote on these.

2. The NONPARTISAN portion, which contains propositions, judges, etc. on which everyone is entitled to vote.

   **Step One**

   In voting the partisan portion of your ballot you will be given a paper “sample ballot” with the names and punch position numbers of your party’s candidates.

   Take your punchcard ballot and the paper “sample ballot” into one of the booths.

   Place your ballot on top of the styrofoam board.

   Using the small blue stylus needle in the booth, punch out the numbers on the punchcard ballot corresponding to your choice of party candidates.

   **Step Two**

   Now you are ready to vote the nonpartisan portion of your ballot.

   Take your punchcard ballot and insert it into the voting machine as shown on page 6. VOTE ONLY ON THE GREEN PAGES of the voting machine. Ignore the white pages; the white pages of the machine are applicable only to one of the other political parties, not yours.

   If you try to vote the white pages on the voting machine the computer will ignore any votes cast on the white pages (your votes on the green pages of the voting machine will be counted no matter what).

   **REMEMBER:**

   - Vote the partisan portion of your ballot by using the paper “sample ballot” and poking out the appropriate numbers on your ballot card.

   - Vote the nonpartisan portion by inserting your card in the voting machine and using the GREEN pages ONLY.

   - Ignore the white pages on the voting machine.

   If you make a mistake the poll workers will give you a fresh ballot if you ask for it.

   Before returning your voted ballot, make sure there are no little paper chips hanging from the back side of your ballot.

   To determine which political party you are registered with, please refer to the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party code is printed directly above your name. “P+F” means Peace & Freedom, “LBN” means Libertarian and “AIP” means American Independent Party.

   **NOTICE**

   If you are registered as a member of the Libertarian, Peace & Freedom or American Independent parties you will be receiving the partisan portion of your sample ballot in the mail in a few days.

   The nonpartisan portion of your ballot appears on the following pages.
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR NONPARTISAN VOTERS

On election day you will be voting in booths set up for Republicans and Democrats.

Nonpartisan voters are eligible to vote only on propositions and on candidates for nonpartisan offices such as Judge, Superintendent of Public Instruction, etc. These propositions and candidates are all contained in the green pages of the voting machine.

After you sign in at your precinct you will be given a tan ballot card. Take the card into the voting booth and insert it into the voting machine as shown in the instructions on page 6.

Then turn to the green pages on the voting machine. Vote only the green pages and ignore the white pages of the voting machine.

To find out if you are a nonpartisan voter, please refer to the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. The letters “N/P” above your name indicate nonpartisan voter.
Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their party.

Your party needs your support. Both money and volunteers are needed in the campaign. The address and phone number of your party are printed below:

LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Send contributions to:

Libertarian Party Headquarters
1800 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94102

For information on the Libertarian Party, call 864-0952 or visit the Libertarian Bookstore at 1800 Market Street.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Send contributions to:

American Independent Party
64 Joost Street
San Francisco, California 94131

For information on the American Independent Party call 587-9636.

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY

Send contributions to:

Peace & Freedom Party
459 Ellis Street #250
San Francisco, California 94102
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To vote on any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TAREA DE VOTO ÚNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfóra la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando hay dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfóra la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desee votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobres de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfóra la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SÍ" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o burdades están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfóra, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvalo al miembro del consejo del precincto y obtenga otra.

AAEEE/EEA

選民須知:

投票前請選擇任何一位候選人，請在選票上對應候選人的姓名欄打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選票上對應候選人的姓名欄打孔。選擇投票候選人時，請在選票上對應候選人的姓名欄打孔。過多或過少打孔者，票數作廢。

投票合併的職務競選人，請在選票上對應候選人的姓名欄打孔。如有選票不完整或投票機器故障等問題，在選票上對應候選人的姓名欄打孔。過多或過少打孔者，票數作廢。

如果選票不慎損壞，請撕掉選票，取得新的選票。投票前請核對選票上的選舉資訊，並索取一張選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

请在下页开始投票

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>For 212, Against 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>President of Senate. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>Yes 215, No 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Taxation, Real Property Valuation. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>Yes 219, No 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bail. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>Yes 223, No 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>Yes 228, No 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>Yes 232, No 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Dispone emisión de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Renueva la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicepresidente asume la presidencia del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ninguno.

3. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALUACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Eximen la extinción de "cumulative" para evitar recaudación de propiedad (cada imposición por gravamen de medias de tipo de derecho emitida). Impacto fiscal: Reducción de redúncias del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en los costos administrativos para gobierno local. Incremento en los costos relativos al proporcionar administración compensativa a los distintos escenarios locales y de colegios de la comunidad. Aumento en los redúncias del impuesto a la renta debido a reducciones menores del impuesto a la propiedad.

4. FIJACIÓN. Prohibir la venta de bienes bajo fianza cuando la corte tiene reuniones de investigación concurrentes. Al publicar la fianza, la persona puede seguir ejerciendo sus derechos al fianza. Impacto fiscal: Aumento en el costo de los gastos legales de concurrencia y sustanciales en una fianza. Pueden haber aumentos compensativos si la persona fuera más tarde sentenciada a la carcel o a la prisión.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
三藩市縣地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

所得税指數調整 創制法案 規定增加尺寸使用物
即指數百分率調整個人所得稅比率低額的基
础。財政上所受影響：加州稅收在一九八一
三八三年中減少二億三千萬元。一九八三一八四
年減少四億四千五百萬元，以後年年少於此數。
加州政府稅收減少，其補助地方政府與學校
的經費亦相應減少。

刑事裁判 修改憲法及制定法規，處理訴訟程
序、判決、釋放被告與定罪犯，及有關受 trovare
事件。財政上的影響：加州與地方政府所受耗
費重大，難以確定其程度。

水利設備包括大壩運河 改“是”票而贊成
或“否”票面反對。一項法規指定中央流域計
劃增加水利設施。財政上的影響：照目前政策
施工，加州政府不必付稅，亦無須銷減加州其
他計劃的經費。已批准的計劃繼續按原一九八
一年物價計算，會超過十三億元，但用戶收
費增加，可以補貼。

重新劃分國會選區 改“是”票而贊成，改
“否”票面反對。一九八一年制定的法規採用
四十五個國會選區的界限。財政上的影響：
如能通過，加州與地方政府不必無償。如遭反
對，加州政府須耗款二十五萬元，縣政府耗
費二十五萬元。

重新劃分（加州）參議區 改“是”票而贊成，
改“否”票面反對。一九八一年加州議會制定
一法規，改訂四十七個參議區的界線。財政上的
影響：如能通過，加州與地方政府的經費不受
影響。如遭反對，加州政府須耗款三十七萬元，
縣政府耗費五十萬元。

重新劃分（加州）眾議區 改“是”票而贊成，
改“否”票面反對。一九八一年加州議會頒佈
一法令，改訂八十八個眾議區的界線。財政上的
影響：如能通過，加州與地方政府不用稅款。
如遭否決，加州政府耗費四十萬元，縣政府
耗費十五萬元。

237 SI 贊成 238 NO 反對
241 SI 贊成 242 NO 反對
246 SI 贊成 247 NO 反對
250 SI 贊成 251 NO 反對
254 SI 贊成 255 NO 反對
258 SI 贊成 259 NO 反對
### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**A** Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?  
- **YES** 263 →  
- **NO** 264 →

**B** Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?  
- **YES** 267 →  
- **NO** 268 →

**C** Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?  
- **YES** 271 →  
- **NO** 272 →

**D** Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?  
- **YES** 274 →  
- **NO** 275 →

**E** Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?  
- **YES** 278 →  
- **NO** 279 →

**F** Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?  
- **YES** 281 →  
- **NO** 282 →

**G** Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?  
- **YES** 285 →  
- **NO** 286 →

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**  
**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION PRIMARIA - 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES
CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反对

A. ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de papeles sobre impuestos a recoger en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?

267 SI 贊成
268 NO 反对

B. ¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores otorgar el Registro Electoral que llave a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, declarada o especial por medio del correo?

271 SI 贊成
272 NO 反对

C. ¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que se encuentre en un servicio que tenga la población más grande?

274 SI 贊成
275 NO 反对

D. ¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los defunciones sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados partecipantes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

278 SI 贊成
279 NO 反对

E. ¿Se deberá permitir el cáncer subvencional de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al extremo de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

281 SI 贊成
282 NO 反对

F. ¿Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuario y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el análisis del actuario llevado a cabo por lo menos cada cinco años, y que estos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反对

G. ¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los dinero de pensión para inversiones sujetas a las poderes de revisión del Controlador?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by retired members and the supervisors' member to be changed from President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of the Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remedial actions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Pregunta o Debate</th>
<th>Respuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública, incluyendo dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un ampliado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones, incluyendo dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un ampliado jubilado a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores y la designación del personal civil del Secretario General Administrador debe ser eliminada?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar sujeto al movimiento del personal civil y permitirse que dicho Administrador designe a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo al antojo del administrador?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un asistente legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al antojo del miembro?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Deberá el supervisor que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisores a establecer una nueva ley de 1983 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 8 de enero de 1983 y cada segunda año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibió la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de supervisores efectuada deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Declaración de Política: Deberá la ciudad y condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para hacer cálculos digitales para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Declaración de Política: Se está considerando la creación de una compañía de energía que recoja las residuales del servicio público de las residuales de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico y recomendaría claramente que la Comisión Estatal de Servicio Público reduzca las tarifas a las 29 de diciembre de 1981 y además pedir otros remisiones.</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

---

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party’s candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day; or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

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

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril I. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Vanuris, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Estera, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Enma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Walter H. Sharenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reid, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Famaun, 2307 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagai, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Height, Deputy Sheriff
Carlotta Texidor Del Porto, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Estera, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fricke, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secy, Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea J. Jegs, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Maginn, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Ostrin, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2832 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadley Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Tori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanzey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

* Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
* Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
* Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyetman; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Farnam and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalia Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan, I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:

Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICI PATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues
The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((herein)) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year

in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which said evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:
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S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:  
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:  
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donniell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbajelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon, Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City’s contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.”

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category "Surviving Spouse" and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Harry G. Britt  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by: Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molnar, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaglio, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Paritchan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8
Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee’s surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee’s spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost," Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Malini
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Leo S. Dulan
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

**PROPOSITION G**
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

**PROPOSAL:** Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “G”**

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “G”**

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

---

**NOTE**

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment. VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on “H”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees’ representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingúes especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Honigsto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.

2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

(end)
PROPOSITION L.
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller's Statement on "L"

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahtirron
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylasc
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermite Johnson
Olga Johnson
France Keegan
Marion Kell
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elise Kurope
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John MacK
New Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cechi
Elizabeth Connell
Margarette Connoly
Erwin Delman
Ora Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Deutschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatouh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Ebel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortenson
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefan Phipps
Al Roensch
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salarino
Nicholas A. Supnar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seece
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Suhoda
Richard Sceo
James Timossi
Fritz Tocah
John Van Heusen
Alexandra Vukitch
Dorothy Vukitch
Raymond Vukitch
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borsice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Harley, Union official
Moriance McInerney, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orell
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tiney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M

Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City’s law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

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

“Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don't just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don't have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultra-modern "tools" they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

- Supervisor Harry Britt
- Supervisor Nancy Walker
- Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.
Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.
Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!
Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.
PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG and E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.
Check the facts.
Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer
Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION B**

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

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE**

**PROPOSITION C**

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

proved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

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

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

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

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

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund
There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System (C), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.
(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.
(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active

employee members.
(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition theretofore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition theretofore submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviv-

ing spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who marries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The mortality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (e) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: (the chairman of the finance committee) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; (two) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of (one) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 (each of the following years) and every five years thereafter; (1959, 1961 and 1963); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in (each of the following years) 1985 and every five years thereafter; (1960 and 1962) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
(Proposition H, Continued)

sident official of an insurance company, (and,) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; (and,) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years (one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years there-

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((,)) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system,)) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply

((,)) provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their party.

Your party needs your support. Both money and volunteers are needed in the campaign. The address and phone number of your party are printed below:

LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Send contributions to:

Libertarian Party Headquarters
1800 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94102

For information on the Libertarian Party, call 864-0952 or visit the Libertarian Bookstore at 1800 Market Street.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Send contributions to:

American Independent Party
64 Joost Street
San Francisco, California 94131

For information on the American Independent Party call 587-9636.

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY

Send contributions to:

Peace & Freedom Party
459 Ellis Street #250
San Francisco, California 94102
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT

APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

Por la presente solicito una balota de Votante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

BALLE OF TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:

ENVIÉME LA BALOTA A:

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL

FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

Si usted se ha cambiado

Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y

reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que

aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambio el ___________________ de 19 _____

Mi dirección es ____________________________

Area Postal _____________________________

NOTA: Un votante que se cambie dentro de los 29
días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que
se cambie antes de los 29 días anteriores a la elección y que no se registre antes de
la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

If you have moved

Complete this section if you have moved and

now reside at an address other than that

shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ___________________ 19 _____

My residence address is _____________________________

Zip Code __________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior
to this election may obtain an ab-
sentee ballot. A voter moving more
than 29 days prior to this election
and who did not re-register prior to
the registration closing date for this
election is not eligible to vote.

MAIL TO:

ENVÍAR A:

ABSENT VOTING SECTION

REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE

ROOM 158, CITY HALL

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR’S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982.

7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

La solicitud debe recibirse en la oficina
Del registrador antes de las cinco en punto
De la tarde, martes 1 de junio.

El séptimo día anterior al día de la
Elección.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

申請缺席選票必須在選舉日七日之前
提交。星期二下午五時前由
選民註冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。
Voter Selection Coupon

Application for Absentee Ballot appears on Page 63

Application para Papelitas de Votantes ausente aparece en la Página 63

Join the Assembly District 17th Assembly District Freedom Peace & Freedom Libertarian American Independent Nonpartisan

Location of Your Polling Place

Mailing Address

Carrier Route, Box 157
558-3417

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters
100 Citi Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
San Francisco
Voter Information
Pamphlet

Primary Election
June 8, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 4

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#-Area EAST of (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters

N-19
PROPPOSITION D
Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
Analysis ........................................ 34
Argument ....................................... 35
Text of proposed law .................. 58, 59

PROPPOSITION E
Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.
Analysis ........................................ 36
Argument ....................................... 37
Text of proposed law .................. 60

PROPPOSITION F
Establishes procedural and bookkeeping changes in the City’s retirement system.
Analysis ........................................ 38
Argument ....................................... 39
Text of proposed law .................. 60

PROPPOSITION G
Gives the Retirement Board exclusive jurisdiction over investment of pension funds.
Analysis ........................................ 40
Argument ....................................... 41
Text of proposed law .................. 41

PROPPOSITION H
Changes the composition of the Health Service Board.
Analysis ........................................ 42
Argument ....................................... 43
Text of proposed law .................. 60, 61

PROPPOSITION I
Changes the composition of the Retirement Board and removes Manager from Civil Service.
Analysis ........................................ 44
Argument ....................................... 45
Text of proposed law .................. 61

PROPPOSITION J
Two Retirement System administrators to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
Analysis ........................................ 46
Argument ....................................... 47
Text of proposed law .................. 47

PROPPOSITION K
Supervisors’ legislative aides to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
Analysis ........................................ 48
Argument ....................................... 49
Text of proposed law .................. 49

PROPPOSITION L
Board Presidency would go to supervisory candidate who received the most votes.
Analysis ........................................ 50
Arguments ..................................... 51, 52
Text of proposed law .................. 52

PROPPOSITION M
 Declares it to be City policy to purchase a fingerprint computer.
Analysis ........................................ 53
Arguments ..................................... 54

PROPOTION N
Declares opposition to recent PG&E rate increases.
Analysis ........................................ 55
Arguments ..................................... 56
Text of proposed declaration ........ 56

CREDITS
The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this pamphlet were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the committee are Judith Anderson (Chair), Nancy Yoshihara Mayeda, Cecile Michael, Jane Morrison and Dick Robertson, Chief Deputy City Attorney Thomas Toomey serves on the committee as legal advisor.

The map of the new districts on the cover was done by Lorraine Perkins.

The printer was Gazette Press, Inc.
**HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER**

**STEP 1**

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

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

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**

INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

**STEP 2**

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

**STEP 3**

**HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP).**

PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

**STEP 4**

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

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

**A 第四步**

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
STEP ONE

(INSTRUCTIONS FOR AMERICAN INDEPENDENT, PEACE & FREEDOM AND LIBERTARIAN VOTERS ONLY)

1. Make your choice from the sample ballot you will receive at the polls.

   ![Sample Ballot Diagram]

2. Using the wire pin clipped to your ballot card, punch out dot on the ballot card over the number of your choice for candidate or "YES" or "NO" on measures.

   ![Use pin provided to punch out chip on ballot.]

3. After voting the partisan portion of your ballot, place the ballot card into the machine and continue voting on the green pages.
HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

**STEP 1**

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

**USING BOTH HANDS**
Insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

**STEP 2**

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

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

**STEP 3**

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

**STEP 4**

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

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

B Fourth Step

投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白袋內，票尾凸出在外。

在封袋上，空白天格預備為投票人應用。
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTERS
REGISTERED IN THE FOLLOWING POLITICAL PARTIES:
LIBERTARIAN PARTY
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY
AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Your ballot is divided into two parts:

1. The PARTISAN portion, which contains the candidates of your party. Only members of your party may vote on these.

2. The NONPARTISAN portion, which contains propositions, judges, etc. on which everyone is entitled to vote.

**Step One**

In voting the partisan portion of your ballot you will be given a paper “sample ballot” with the names and punch position numbers of your party’s candidates.

Take your punchcard ballot and the paper “sample ballot” into one of the booths.

Place your ballot on top of the styrofoam board.

Using the small blue stylus needle in the booth, punch out the numbers on the punchcard ballot corresponding to your choice of party candidates.

**Step Two**

Now you are ready to vote the nonpartisan portion of your ballot.

Take your punchcard ballot and insert it into the voting machine as shown on page 6. VOTE ONLY ON THE GREEN PAGES of the voting machine. Ignore the white pages; the white pages of the machine are applicable only to one of the other political parties, not yours.

If you try to vote the white pages on the voting machine the computer will ignore any votes cast on the white pages (your votes on the green pages of the voting machine will be counted no matter what).

**REMEMBER:**

- Vote the partisan portion of your ballot by using the paper “sample ballot” and poking out the appropriate numbers on your ballot card.
- Vote the nonpartisan portion by inserting your card in the voting machine and using the GREEN pages ONLY.
- Ignore the white pages on the voting machine.

If you make a mistake the poll workers will give you a fresh ballot if you ask for it.

Before returning your voted ballot, make sure there are no little paper chips hanging from the back side of your ballot.

To determine which political party you are registered with, please refer to the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. Your party code is printed directly above your name. “P+F” means Peace & Freedom, “LBN” means Libertarian and “AIP” means American Independent Party.

**NOTICE**

If you are registered as a member of the Libertarian, Peace & Freedom or American Independent parties you will be receiving the partisan portion of your sample ballot in the mail in a few days.

The nonpartisan portion of your ballot appears on the following pages.
SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR NONPARTISAN VOTERS

On election day you will be voting in booths set up for Republicans and Democrats.

Nonpartisan voters are eligible to vote only on propositions and on candidates for nonpartisan offices such as Judge, Superintendent of Public Instruction, etc. These propositions and candidates are all contained in the green pages of the voting machine.

After you sign in at your precinct you will be given a tan ballot card. Take the card into the voting booth and insert it into the voting machine as shown in the instructions on page 6.

Then turn to the green pages on the voting machine. Vote only the green pages and ignore the white pages of the voting machine.

To find out if you are a nonpartisan voter, please refer to the address label on the back cover of this pamphlet. The letters “N/P” above your name indicate nonpartisan voter.
Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their party.

Your party needs your support. Both money and volunteers are needed in the campaign. The address and phone number of your party are printed below:

LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Send contributions to:

Libertarian Party Headquarters
1800 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94102

For information on the Libertarian Party, call 864-0952 or visit the Libertarian Bookstore at 1800 Market Street.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Send contributions to:

American Independent Party
64 Joost Street
San Francisco, California 94131

For information on the American Independent Party call 587-9636.

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY

Send contributions to:

Peace & Freedom Party
459 Ellis Street #250
San Francisco, California 94102
PUNCH OUT BALLOT CARD ONLY WITH PUNCHING DEVICE ATTACHED TO VOTE RECORDER; NEVER WITH PEN OR PENCIL.

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS:

To vote for any candidate of your selection, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite that candidate's name. Where two or more candidates for the same office are to be elected, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow opposite the names of all candidates for the office for whom you desire to vote, not to exceed, however, the number of candidates to be elected.

To vote for a qualified write-in candidate, write the title of the office and the person's name in the blank space provided for that purpose on the Write-In Ballot Envelope.

To mark any measure, punch the ballot card in the hole at the point of the arrow after the "YES" or after the word "NO".

All distinguishing marks or erasures are forbidden and make the ballot void.

If you wrongly punch, tear, or deface the ballot card, or tear or deface the Write-In Ballot Envelope, return it to the precinct board member and obtain another.

PERFORE LA TARETA DE VOTO UNICAMENTE CON EL PICADOR ATADO EN LA CUERDA AL REGISTRADOR; NO USE PLUMA NI LAPIZ.

INSTRUCCIONES A LOS VOTANTES:

Para votar por candidato de su selección, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta al nombre del candidato. Cuando han de ser elegidos dos o más candidatos para el mismo cargo, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha opuesta de los nombres de todos los candidatos para el cargo por quienes usted desea votar, sin exceder al número de candidatos que ha de ser elegido.

Para votar por un candidato (write-in) calificado, escriba el título del cargo y el nombre de la persona en los espacios en blanco provistos para este fin en el Sobre de la Balota.

Para votar sobre cualquier medida, perfure la balota en el círculo que señala la flecha después de la palabra "SI" o después de la palabra "NO".

Todas las marcas o borradoras están prohibidas e invalidan el voto. Si usted equivocadamente perfura, rompe o estropea la balota, o rompe o estropea el sobre, devuélvala al miembro del consejo del precinto y obtenga otra.

選民須知：

選出合格的任何其他候選人，請在選舉表上對應所列候選人名打孔。如果有兩個或以上候選人競選同一職位，請在選舉表上對應所列之所有候選人中，選出你要競選的候選人打孔，但不超過選舉表的規定數量。

選舉合格的非候選人候選人，請在非候選人選舉選票所提供的非候選選票上選出候選人所候選的職位和候選人的姓名。

選出任何候選人，請在選舉表上對應所列 "YES" 或 "NO" 字樣打孔。

選舉表上若有漏舉或塗鴉者，選舉作廢。

如果你在選舉表上打孔誤了，郵寄或寄錯了；或選舉表打孔了的選舉選票，要
把該選舉選票給選舉員的監督員，另索取一份選票。

TO START YOUR VOTING GO TO NEXT PAGE

PARA COMENZAR A VOTAR DE VUELTA A LA PROXIMA PAGINA
### JUDICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Vote per Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBACH</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRAROD</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
### MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS
#### STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>YES 215</td>
<td>NO 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends &quot;change in ownership&quot; definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES 219</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>YES 223</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state &quot;pickup&quot; estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 228</td>
<td>NO 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state &quot;pickup&quot; estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 232</td>
<td>NO 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
### PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Detalles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Disponer cantidad de fondos por 495,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>En contra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revisa la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicepresidente seas Presidente del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estatal o local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIVISIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALUACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Exemplia la disolución de “casas de duelo” para excluir reemplazos de propiedad insatisfecho por procedimientos de tipo de duelo emitido. Impacto fiscal: Significativa pérdida de riqueza del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en los costos administrativos para gobernadores locales. Incrementa en los costos administrativos al propietario además de dañar propiedades de los distritos escolares locales y de colegios de la comunidad. Aumenta en los rieles estatales el impuesto a la riqueza debido a reducciones menores del impuesto a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIANZA. Prohibir dar libertad bajo fianza cuando la corte tiene resultados de investigación concurrentes a la probabilidad de que la persona puesto en libertad pueda causar grava daño físico a otras. Impacto fiscal: Aumenta el costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelar y medir a la cárcel para fines de seguridad. Perdería habrá costos compensatorios si la persona fuera más tarde sentenciada a la cárcel o a la prisión.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides
continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer
Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by
about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing
amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding
reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning
procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and
regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be
predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes”
vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central
Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no
increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required.
Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus
unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote
approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting
boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no
state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of
$350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves,
“No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries
of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If
rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves,
“No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries
of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs.
If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
REINIGический исполнительный орган, хозяйственный отдел отчет по основным операциям в регионе для 1981-82 годов. Эта информация помогает подсчитать общую величину доходов и расходов на различные проекты и программы в этом регионе.

INSTALACIOPES HYDRAULICAS INCLUIDO EN EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un total de 35 áreas fueron incluidas en el proyecto del Canal Periférico de la ciudad de San Francisco. La construcción de estas áreas fue financiada a través de fondos municipales, federal y estatales. El proyecto incluye la instalanación de sistemas de drenaje y agua potable en áreas urbanas y rurales, lo que mejora la calidad de vida de los vecinos y ayuda a prevenir inundaciones en épocas de lluvias intensas.

JUSTICIA PENAL. Estudia la constitucionalidad y jurisdicción de los juzgados con respecto a las excepciones, controversias y defensa de derechos fundamentales en los tribunales. La constitución de los jueces y fiscales es crucial para garantizar un sistema judicial justo y eficaz.

REINIGический исполнительный орган, хозяйственный отдел отчет по основным операциям в регионе для 1981-82 годов. Эта информация помогает подсчитать общую величину доходов и расходов на различные проекты и программы в этом регионе.

REINIGический исполнительный орган, хозяйственный отдел отчет по основным операциям в регионе для 1981-82 годов. Эта информация помогает подсчитать общую величину доходов и расходов на различные проекты и программы в этом регионе.
### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>Yes 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>Yes 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>Yes 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>Yes 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>Yes 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>Yes 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?</td>
<td>Yes 285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**
**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION PRIMARIA - 5 DE JUNIO DE 1982

MEDIAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES

三藩市縣地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

市與縣提案

263 SI 贊成 A
264 NO 反對

¿Deberá la Junta de Superintendentes tener el poder de probar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos o recibo en la manera establecida por la ley estatal a menos que el decree de la Junta de Superintendentes?

市參議會應是否有借款。依照州法律或市參議會法令發行預期稅收債券?

267 SI 贊成 B
268 NO 反對

¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Superintendentes ordenar el Registro de Callejero que dé a cabo cualquier licencia del municipio general, alcalde a especial por medio del correo?

市參議會應否獲准按選民名冊由郵寄形式舉行普選、複選或特別市選?

271 SI 贊成 C
272 NO 反對

¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a un plan de salud para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los diez candidatos del estado que tengan la posición más grande?

市政府應否為市職工發付牙醫保健費，保健費為加州人口數中十個縣區的平均保健費?

274 SI 贊成 D
275 NO 反對

¿Debería la ciudad sobreasignar a los empleados sobrevivientes de los empleados fallecidos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad sobreasigna a los empleados activos a jubilados que pertenecen al Sistema de Servicio de Sanidad?

市政府應否在同一基礎上支付在職員工和已退休員工的未亡配偶。一如市政府津貼在職服務制度內的在職員工和已退休員工?

278 SI 贊成 E
279 NO 反對

¿Debería permitir el sistema de jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continua recibir dicha pensión el cuarto de año después de los 60 años de edad?

退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶。目前可享受補助金，如果他們在六十歲後再婚，應否繼續享受退休補助金?

281 SI 贊成 F
282 NO 反對

¿Debería llevar a cabo investigaciones de actitud y de experiencia del sistema de jubilaciones como los son detenidos por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el objeto del actual cargo a cabal de lo menos cada dos años y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?

退休制度的保險統計和人員調查。應否每年舉行一次，由退休局裁定保險金額和某些費用，由市政府支付?

285 SI 贊成 G
286 NO 反對

¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar las pensiones para jubilaciones sujeta a las poderes de revisión del Contralor?

退休局應否具有唯一的權力，以管理退休金用於投資，但須受市審計官審核的約束?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisoral election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisoral election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Deberá cambiarse la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado público a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designada por la Junta de Supervisores?

5. Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y contar cuenta del Servicio Civil y para que administrar el servicio en tanto y en cualquiera de dichos administradores designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo al entero del administrativo?

6. Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un ayudante legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al absentismo del miembro?

7. Deberá el superintendente que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisores de noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 6 de enero de 1981 y cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos durante la última elección de supervisores ofreciendo deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

8. Declaración de Política: Deberá la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para hacer las declaraciones electrónicas para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?

Declaración de Política: 4. Deberá la Ciudad y el Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para hacer las declaraciones electrónicas para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:

- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a citizen of the United States.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don't tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party's choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:

- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:

- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)

(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters' Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters' handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes, You can vote early by:

- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year
- mailing in the application sent with this voters' pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar's Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:

- That you need to vote early
- your registered voting address
- the address where you want the ballot mailed
- then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.

When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

**PRIMARY ELECTION** — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**CHARTER** — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

**TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE** — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

**FISCAL YEAR** — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

**PETITION** — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**SUPERVISORS** — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR</th>
<th>CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAM DUCA</strong></td>
<td><strong>JEFF BROWN</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**My address is 16 Wawona Street**

**My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco**

**My qualifications for office are:** Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
- Cyril J. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
- George R. Reilly, 2747-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
- Stan Smith, 411 Feltón, Union Official
- Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
- Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
- William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
- Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
- Lee Varunis, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
- Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
- Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
- Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
- Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
- Erma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
- Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
- H. Welton Flynn, 35 Venus, Public Accounting
- Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
- Reverend John Loschavo, Golden Gate & Parker Sts., Pres. Univ. S.F.
- Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
- James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
- Thomas J. Mellom, 310 Arballo, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
- William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
- William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City employee
- Sally B. Famarin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
- Lucia Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
- William Markovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
- Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
- Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
- Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

| Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy. |
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57

My occupation is Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gynman; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalie Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeannie Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
A Tax Anticipation Notes

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco's charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition "A", use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "A" means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "A".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Proposition "A" is designed to save money for the City. "A" involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition "A" does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City's cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A Yes on Proposition "A" would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition "A" is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous "rip off" of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress "wises up" and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

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

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

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues
The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle encumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transferred or loaned fund shall be charged shall be encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (herein) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller's Statement on “B”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election."

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition "B" will prevent this waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition "B" will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A "YES" vote for Proposition "B" will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won't have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting "YES" for Proposition "B" will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco's taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote "YES" on Proposition "B".

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give undue advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don’t be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters’ rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let’s not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
 Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
 Supervisor Wendy Nelder
 Walter J. O’Donnell
 Patrick J. Brady
 John J. Barbagliata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based “Committee for Economic Democracy” will likely suggest that we vote by telephone “call in” next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits. Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hangisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity: It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit; if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Phillip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:  Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
              Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
              John L. Molinari, Board of Supervisors
              Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
              Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
              Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
              Harry Partichhan, Community Health Service Board
              F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
              James R. Wachob, President, District #8
              Democratic Club
              James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
              Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
              Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee’s surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee’s spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaynee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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PROPOSITION F

Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost," Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Honigso
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and
County of San Francisco,
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio.
Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido.
Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.
Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章: 工作良機

你可以在六月八日三藩市選舉日工作。特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘
在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票。請往市政廳（濱街高街）
一五一五室申請。
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G
On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by:  
Supervisor John L. Molinari  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Doris M. Word

Endorsed by:  
Retirement Board of City and  
County of San Francisco  
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H

Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “H”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor, and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by:  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
              Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
              Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “I”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT

James T. Ferguson

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

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.

2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors’ Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.
Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

(end)
PROPOSITION L

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was shouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rahmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Attole
Cheryl Arison
Robert Arison
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylaque
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kelk
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kenneally
Eltie Kuesten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Joyce Brown
Marion Callahan
Donald Casper
Gina Cecchi
Elizabeth Connlin
Margarete Connoly
Erith Delman
Ona Denner
Melba Deni
Anne Deuschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatouh
Martin Felthauer
Elizabeth Feldhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Peter Gladden
Thomas Glaven
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Etzel Martin
Joe McDaid
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Dulce Mertenson
Chris Murphy
Walter O’Donnell
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr.
Lester O’Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefani Pipps
Al Roensch
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salerno
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seebe
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Svoboda
Richard Szeto
James Tinossi
Fritz Totah
John Von Heusden
Alexandra Vukich
Dorothy Vukich
Raymond Vukich
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter’s designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON’T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Minor McHappy, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Mayoan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie O’Ri
Leon O’Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don't just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don't have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultramodern "tools" they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:
"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don’t want to pay for PG&E’s bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let’s be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG and E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Swaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters,
Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E’s purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes

or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

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

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
(Proposition C, Continued)

society, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare. Provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors, and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund
There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System ((()), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

---

**BIG BROTHERS:**

**IT'S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR TWO**

- If you are patient and understanding,
- If your life is stable,
- If you can be a friend to a child, and
- If you have a few hours a week to share (for at least a year);
  Then you may be the perfect Big Brother.

Big Brothers is a non-profit youth service agency which matches male volunteers to boys between the ages of 7 and 17, from father-absent homes.

Being a Big Brother offers a man the unique opportunity to contribute to his community and himself, while providing friendship and guidance to a young boy.

If you are over 18, and interested, call

**BIG BROTHERS** of San Francisco • 434-4860
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8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.594-14 and 8.583-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviv-

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: (the chairman of the finance committee) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; (two) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((3)) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number, ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.)) The members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((3)); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.851 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their party.

Your party needs your support. Both money and volunteers are needed in the campaign. The address and phone number of your party are printed below:

LIBERTARIAN PARTY

Send contributions to:

Libertarian Party Headquarters
1800 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94102

For information on the Libertarian Party, call 864-0952 or visit the Libertarian Bookstore at 1800 Market Street.

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY

Send contributions to:

American Independent Party
64 Joost Street
San Francisco, California 94131

For information on the American Independent Party call 587-9636.

PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY

Send contributions to:

Peace & Freedom Party
459 Ellis Street #250
San Francisco, California 94102
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
   LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
   Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT. Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE
   JUNE 8, 1982
   I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

   請寄一份缺席選票給本人，以參加選舉。
   Por la presente solicito una balota de Votante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
   ENVIEME LA BALOTA A:
   郵寄選票給本人地址：

   DATE: ________________________
   FECHA: ________________________
   Zip Code: ________________________
   Area Postal: ________________________
   郵區號碼: ________________________

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
   FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
   申請人簽名

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
   Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
   申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

6. ☐ I prefer election materials in English
   ☐ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
   如果你已選居

   如果你已選居，現所居住地址不是你在
   註冊選舉暫寄之住址，請填寫此表格。
   我已在一九____年____月____日選居
   我現在的住址是： ________________________
   郵著號碼： ________________________

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ________________________
My residence address is ________________________
Zip Code: ________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Ma cambi el ________________________ de 19 ______
Mi dirección es ________________________
Area Postal: ________________________

NOTA: Un votante que se cambie dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambie antes de los 29 días anteriores de la elección y que no se registre antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ENVÍAR A:
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 150, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR’S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS 5:00 EN PUNTO
DEL TARDE, MARTES 1, 1982,
EL SÉPTIMO DÍA ANTERIOR AL DÍA DE LA
ELECCIÓN.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA.

申请人

FOR REGISTRAR’S USE ONLY
SOLAMENTE PARA USO DEL REGISTRAR

Prep. No. ________________________
Pol. Affil. ________________________
Ballot No. ________________________
Ballot Mailed ________________________
Ballot Returned ________________________
Aff. Record ________________________
Inspector’s Notice ________________________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date: ________________________
Deputy Registrar: ________________________
### Voter Selection Coupon

**Application for Absentee Ballot Appearance on Page 63**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mail Address**

155 City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102-4691

**carrier ROUTE PREFERENCE**

558-3417
558-3061

**POLLING PLACE**

**24-7-6-9**
San Francisco
Voter Information
Pamphlet

Primary Election
June 8, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 4

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
# — Area EAST of ■■■■■ (solid lines)
#17 — Area BETWEEN ■■■■■ (solid lines)
#19 — Area WEST of ■■■■■ (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3 — Area NORTH of ///// (virgule lines)
#8 — Area SOUTH of ///// (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5 — All the UNSHADED area ■■ ■■■
#6 — All the SHADED area *******

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

STEP 1

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

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

B 第一步
将双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

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

C 第二步
请确定将選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

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

D 第三步
请把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

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

STEP 4

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

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白封袋內，票尾突出在外。在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Gobernador</th>
<th>省長</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
<th>選選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>民主黨</td>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer</td>
<td>退休包裝工人</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>州</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enlutador Empacador Jubilado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>政治學者－教師</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Científico Politico-Maestro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor</td>
<td>樹木外科醫生－按摩脊椎治療員</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cirujano de los Arboles-Quiropractico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
<td>家庭協調員，諮詢員</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinadora de Familia, Asesora (Consejera)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
<td>洛杉磯市市長</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman, Comerciante</td>
<td>商人</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Custodián, Portero</td>
<td>看守人</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Autobotle Fleet Manager, Gerente de Flota de Automóviles</td>
<td>汽車隊管理</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEN &quot;GOLF&quot; TREVINO</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattleman, Granjero-Ganadero</td>
<td>農夫－牧夫</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank L. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator, Abogado/Farmacéutico/Administrador</td>
<td>律師／藥劑師／管理人</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive, Escritora, Consultora, Ejecutiva</td>
<td>作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman, Actor, Maestro, Comerciante</td>
<td>演員，教師，商人</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader, Líder de la Mayoría en el Senado</td>
<td>參議院多數黨領袖</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

民主黨於一九八二年六月八日，州證選選票。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vicegobernador</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEO T. MCCARTHY</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assembleman, California Legislature</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Asambleista, de la Legislatura de California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Writer, Consultant, Executive</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Escrítor, Consultor, Ejecutivo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILL WATKINS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Businessman/Minister</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comerciante/Pastor Protestante</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA JR.</strong></td>
<td><strong>President, Correctional Association</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presidente, Asociación Correccional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|                  | <strong>Secretary of State</strong> | <strong>Secretario de Estado</strong> |              |              |
|                  |                        |                          |              |              |
| <strong>MARCH FONG EU</strong> | <strong>Secretary of State, State of California</strong> | 45           |              |
|                  | <strong>Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California</strong> |              |              |
| <strong>KENNETH R. SMITH</strong> | <strong>Solar/Plumbing Contractor Solar/Fontanero (Plomero)</strong> | 47           |              |
|                  | <strong>Contratista</strong> |              |              |
| <strong>HELEN HOWARD</strong>  | <strong>Commissioner</strong> | 49           |              |
|                  | <strong>Comisionada</strong> |              |              |
| <strong>ALICE KEYSER</strong>  | <strong>Businesswoman</strong> | 51           |              |
|                  | <strong>Mujer Comerciante</strong> |              |              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>IRA CLARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMER L. RAINS</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN CHURCH</td>
<td>Retired County Supervisor</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>U.S. Senator’s Deputy</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</td>
<td>Public Affairs Counselor</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN KOPP</td>
<td>County Supervisor/Lawyer</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE SCOTT</td>
<td>Board Certified Appraiser</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>Board Equalization Deputy</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. WERTZ JR.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORE VIDAL</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HAMPTON</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. BUCHANAN</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM METZGER</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MORGAN</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Busing Advocate/Clergyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator, State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPLETTE</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Machinist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL K. WHITEHURST</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Fresno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>ELECCION PRIMARIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</td>
<td>JUNE 8, 1982</td>
<td>8 DE JUNIO DE 1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>MEMBER, STATE ASSEMBLY</th>
<th>MIEMBRO, ASAMBLEISTA ESTATAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly - 16th Assembly District</td>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>Casto del Asamblía - Distrito #16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress - 5th District</td>
<td>PHILLIP BURTON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>155</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Stallings</td>
<td>Human Rights Coordinator/Coordinador de Derechos Humanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie Griffith</td>
<td>D.A. Investigator/investigadora del Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rabisa</td>
<td>State Employee/Empleado Estatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido E. Nannini</td>
<td>Chairman, Assembly District/Presidente, Asamblea del Distrito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. Newkirk</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Nolan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ann Post</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansy Ponzi</td>
<td>Community Liaison Representative/Representante Coordinadora de la Comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Kretting</td>
<td>Environmentalist, Neighborhood Worker/Especialista en Medio/Ambiente, Trabajador del Vecindario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve Jones</td>
<td>Legislative Assistant/Asistente Legislativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Trujillo</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie O'Connor</td>
<td>Lieutenant, Sheriff's Dept./Lugartimiento, Dept. del Aguacito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Anne Miller</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland S. (Lee) Meyerzove</td>
<td>Journalist/Community Representative/Periodista/Representante de la Comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick C. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPARTISAN PRIMARY ELECTION</td>
<td>NO PARTIDO ELECCION PRIMARIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUDICIAL</strong></td>
<td>非黨派公職</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCY</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD E. BEER</td>
<td>Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent of Public Instruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Superintendente de Instrucción Publica</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td>Principal/Directora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td>Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Membro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANET L. ALLLEN</td>
<td>Educator-Businesswoman/Educatora-Mujer Comerciante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL NUBAUM</td>
<td>Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td>School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CITY &amp; COUNTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assesor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Defender</strong></td>
<td><strong>Defensor Público</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>YES 215</td>
<td>NO 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends &quot;change in ownership&quot; definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES 219</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>YES 223</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 228</td>
<td>NO 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 232</td>
<td>NO 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

1. ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Cigüeñas emitidas de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usadas en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicepresidente sea Presidente del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estál o local.

3. FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS, VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Ernestina la estación de "cambio de escala" para evitar recaudación de propiedades tenidas por funcionarios de todo el estado. Impacto fiscal: Dificilmente se produzca pérdida de recaudación en la propiedad, y no afecta a las cuotas administrativas o gobiernos locales. Incrementa en las cuotas estatales, los gobiernos locales a su cargo las cuotas de los municipios. Autoriza en las cuotas estatales del impuesto a la renta, debiendo a sus residentes más bajos del impuesto a la propiedad.

4. FIJACION. Prohibición de libertad bajo fianza cuando la carta tiene rezagos. Dado que la cartas tienen rezagos, la fianza puede cubrir grave daño a las fuerzas. Impact fiscal: Aumenta el costo de las cuotas estatales de escuadrón de policía y policías judiciales para fines. Podría haber banderas de tres personajes si la persona fuera más tarde multada o a la cárcel o a la prisión.


INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Aprobación</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>JUSTICIA PENAL. Proposición de la Constitución la penalización y prever estatuto con respecto a las procedencias, sentencias y ejecución de personas acusadas y condenadas y en lo que se refiere a las víctimas. Decreto fiscal: Cantos altos de los que no pueden ser premiados con ningún grado de corte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que dispondrá instalaciones de canales de agua adicionales del Proyecto del Delta Central. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>JUICIO DE PROVINCIA. Ampliación de la Constitución en el referéndum que aprueba la ley de justicia penal. Impacto fiscal: Cantos altos de los que no pueden ser premiados con ningún grado de corte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO CONGRESIONAL. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO CONGRESIONAL. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO CONGRESIONAL. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO CONGRESIONAL. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO SENSORIAL. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO SENSORIAL. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aprueba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 259    | NO   | 12         | REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITO DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, una ley que aprueba redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos presentes, se anula regularmente en los impuestos estatales el redimensionamiento de la propiedad destinada a obras públicas. Se aprueba la ley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO  
ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA – 6 DE JUNIO DE 1992

MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES
CIUDAD Y CONDADO

263 SI 贊成 A  
¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sobre impuestos a recaudar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal a menos que el alcance del diseño de la Junta de Supervisores?

264 NO 反對

267 SI 贊成 B  
¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que llene a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, designa a un empleado por medio del correo?

268 NO 反對

271 SI 贊成 C  
¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para las empleadas de la ciudad que reúnan una contribución promedio de los diez años del estado que inicie la población más grande?

272 NO 反對

274 SI 贊成 D  
¿Deberá la ciudad subsanar a los ciudadanos superintendientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subsanar a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

275 NO 反對

278 SI 贊成 E  
¿Deberá permitir al ciudadano superintendente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al cuarto de suena después de los 60 años de edad?

279 NO 反對

281 SI 贊成 F  
¿Deberá llevarse a cabo una investigación de acoso y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como se ha sido determinada por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el análisis del estudio llevado a cabo por el menos cada diez años y si ciertos guantes sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?

282 NO 反對

285 SI 贊成 G  
¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los dineros de pensión para intereses bajo la protección del Contralor?

286 NO 反對
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>288 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>289 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>297 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310 SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311 NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, the only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United States Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No, California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril I. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Vayure, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jesse A. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erna W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investment
Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arballo, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Fumair, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raimundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gelert Dr., Labor Official
Elisabeth Dua, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagol, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Walt Young Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carolina Testor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jesse T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hills Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secy., Rent Control Board
Matte J. Jackson, 324 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andreas I. Jasper, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Maginn, 999 California, Retailer
Edward P. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. O'Reil, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Haddie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th St., Attorney
Yuri Vada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wofford, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court; former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Ebbie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Kareshi, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

• Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
• Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
• Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Geymant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Faraman and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalia Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner

My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I’ve handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I’ve lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLl

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney

My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan, I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Tax Anticipation Notes

PROPOSITION A

Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by an unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year; and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle encumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purchase of such fund, and shall provide for the fund's return to the fund specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((herein)) heretofore authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25% of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or who shall tender the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes, and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes of other evidences of indebtedness then outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness (Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold municipal elections by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under “Official Advertising”
or “Legal Notices”)
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Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Voting by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by tele

phone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in

terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner
Employee Dental Plan

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

**VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION C**

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition “C” would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits. Vote “YES” on Proposition “C”. A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry G. Britt</td>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy G. Walker</td>
<td>Willie B. Kennedy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C**

Proposition “C” was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition “C”, there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition “C” will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition “C”, as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

**SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION**

Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C**

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like “PULLING TEETH” to get this one past the taxpayers!

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

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by: Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Partichan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wohle, President, District #8
Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dobson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”

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

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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PROPOSITION F

Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city's general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city's general fund.

Controller's Statement on "F"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost;" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.
Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章: 工作良機

你可以在六月八日三百選舉日工作，特別歡迎雙語人士應聘。

在你附近投票站協助選民投票，請往市政廳（潤街及高街）
一五五六室申請。
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment. VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by:  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? INO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?

That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “I”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT

James T. Ferguson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors’ Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT
OF PROP K APPEARS
ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City’s costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member’s pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe. (end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller's Statement on “L”

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Bayliss
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kell
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elsie Kuersien
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Muresko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elisabeth Connick
Margaret Connoly
Ervin Delman
Ora Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Deutschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatooh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Ethel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortensen
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Slemani Phipps
Al Roensch
Marlin Ruanne
Harriet Salerno
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seese
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Sveboda
Richard Szeto
James Timossi
Fritz Tota
John Van Haasen
Alexandra Vuskich
Dorothy Vuskich
Raymond Vuskich
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbegalata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Mortimer McInerny, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orai
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisory election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK.
SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.
Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M
Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED
Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
P.G. & E. Rates

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unaccept-able and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time.”

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
P.G. & E. Rates

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PGandE has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PGandE a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PGandE has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PGandE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local
Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco
Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters,
Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION B**

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

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE**

**PROPOSITION C**

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

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, ((exclusive of dental or optical care)) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the boards of supervisors the amount of such average contributions. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund, but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors (e), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in this proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

County Employees' Retirement System (C), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigning employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such funds or interest may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(b), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 (each of the following years) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
sident official of an insurance company, (and), one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; (and) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years (one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years thereafter.

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the amount of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of (the president) a member of the board of supervisors (i) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, (three members) four members to be appointed by the mayor, (and) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. (who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either) hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among (three) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to (him) the mayor for such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the (six) eight members, other than the (president) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply (i); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
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NOW!

Democracy does not work without thousands of contributors and participants.

Clip out and mail this coupon today:
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☐ I will volunteer in the office.
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<tr>
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Agar Jaicks,
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APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT

1. PRINTED NAME
   LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
   Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
   Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE
   June 8, 1982
   I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

   Por la presente solicito una balota de Volante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
   ENVIENME LA BALOTA A:
  Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
   Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

   DATE:
   FECHA:

   Zip Code
   Código Postal

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
   FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
   If you already reside, present residence address not the registered voter address.
   Si usted se ha cambiado complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y
   presente la dirección en otra dirección distinta a la que
   aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

5. I prefer election materials in English
   Prefiero materiales electorales en español

6. I prefer election materials in English
   Prefiero materiales electorales en español
   O prefero materials to be mailed at no cost.

NOTE: A voter moving within 20 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 20 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

MAIL TO:
ENVIAR A:
Absent Voting Section
Registrar of Voters Office
Room 150, City Hall
San Francisco, CA 94102

Application MUST be received in Registrar's Office by 6:00 P.M.
Tuesday, June 1, 1982.
7 Days Before Election Day.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS 6:00 EN PUNTO
DE LA TARDE, MARTES 1, 1982.
TRES DÍAS ANTERIORES AL DÍA DE LA
ELECCIÓN.
**Voter Selection Coupon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2154</td>
<td>A. 5263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2124</td>
<td>B. 5276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2125</td>
<td>C. 5277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2126</td>
<td>D. 5278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2127</td>
<td>E. 5279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 2128</td>
<td>F. 5280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 2129</td>
<td>G. 5281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 2130</td>
<td>H. 5282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 2131</td>
<td>I. 5283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 2132</td>
<td>J. 5284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Central Committee Members to be elected:**

1. 2133
2. 2134
3. 2135
4. 2136
5. 2137
6. 2138
7. 2139
8. 2140
9. 2141
10. 2142
11. 2143
12. 2144

**Public Defender**

1. 2145
2. 2146
3. 2147
4. 2148
5. 2149
6. 2150
7. 2151
8. 2152
9. 2153
10. 2154
11. 2155
12. 2156

**Judge, Superior Court**

1. 2157
2. 2158
3. 2159
4. 2160
5. 2161
6. 2162
7. 2163
8. 2164
9. 2165
10. 2166
11. 2167
12. 2168

**Judge, Municipal Court**

1. 2169
2. 2170
3. 2171
4. 2172
5. 2173
6. 2174
7. 2175
8. 2176
9. 2177
10. 2178
11. 2179
12. 2180

**Assessor**

1. 2181
2. 2182
3. 2183
4. 2184
5. 2185
6. 2186
7. 2187
8. 2188
9. 2189
10. 2190
11. 2191
12. 2192

**Recorder**

1. 2193
2. 2194
3. 2195
4. 2196
5. 2197
6. 2198
7. 2199
8. 2200
9. 2201
10. 2202
11. 2203
12. 2204

**County Treasurer**

1. 2205
2. 2206
3. 2207
4. 2208
5. 2209
6. 2210
7. 2211
8. 2212
9. 2213
10. 2214
11. 2215
12. 2216

**County Clerk**

1. 2217
2. 2218
3. 2219
4. 2220
5. 2221
6. 2222
7. 2223
8. 2224
9. 2225
10. 2226
11. 2227
12. 2228

**County Board of Education**

1. 2229
2. 2230
3. 2231
4. 2232
5. 2233
6. 2234
7. 2235
8. 2236
9. 2237
10. 2238
11. 2239
12. 2240

**State Board of Equalization**

1. 2241
2. 2242
3. 2243
4. 2244
5. 2245
6. 2246
7. 2247
8. 2248
9. 2249
10. 2250
11. 2251
12. 2252

**Secretary of State**

1. 2253
2. 2254
3. 2255
4. 2256
5. 2257
6. 2258
7. 2259
8. 2260
9. 2261
10. 2262
11. 2263
12. 2264

**Governor**

1. 2265
2. 2266
3. 2267
4. 2268
5. 2269
6. 2270
7. 2271
8. 2272
9. 2273
10. 2274
11. 2275
12. 2276

Application for absentee ballot appears on Page 63.
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

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

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

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

C 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

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

D 第三步
请把带铛之选齐钉，由小孔内垂直插入打孔投票。

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

STEP 4
Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo al cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hash</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JÚSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARCELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman, Comerciante</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Custodian, Portero</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BEN “GOLF” TREVINO</td>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattleman</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney-Pharmacist/Administrator</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman, Comerciante</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leo T. McCarthy</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembyman, California Legislature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asamblesta, de la Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Lee (Bob) Smith</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escritor, Consultor, Ejecutivo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Watkins</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comerciante/Pastor Protestante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>商人／牧師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charles &quot;Chuck&quot; Pineda Jr.</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President, Correctional Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidente, Asociación Correccional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>教養協會主席</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary of State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March Fong Eu</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaría de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>加州州務卿</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenneth R. Smith</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar/Plumbing Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar/Fontanero (Plomero) Contratista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>太陽能／水喉承包商</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helena Howard</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comisionada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>委員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alice Keyser</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesswoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>女商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>California State Controller, Contralor del Estado de California, 加州審計官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>IRA CLARK</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Businessman-Educator, Comerciante-Educador, 商人－教育家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>State Treasurer, Tesorero Estatal, 加州司庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County, Procurador del Distrito del Condado de Los Angeles, 洛杉磯縣郡地方檢察官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMER L. RAINS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Senator/Prosecuting Attorney, Senador/Abogado Fiscal, 參議員／檢察官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member State Board of Equalization – 1st District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento – Distrito #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARREN CHURCH</th>
<th>84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired County Supervisor</td>
<td>退休縣區參議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilado Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONWAY COLLIS</th>
<th>86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Senator's Deputy</td>
<td>美國參議員助理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado de Congresistas de los E.U.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td>公共會計師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contador Publico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Counselor</td>
<td>公共事務顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consejero de Asuntos Publicos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUENTIN KOPP</th>
<th>92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Supervisor/Lawyer</td>
<td>縣區參議員/律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor del Condado/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEONEL MONTEREY</th>
<th>94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>咨商</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAYNE SCOTT</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Certified Appraiser</td>
<td>持證估價員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasador-Valuador Certificado del Consejo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. JOHN SHIMMON</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Equalization Deputy</td>
<td>平等局助理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diputado, Consejo de Igualamiento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Senator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Election</strong></td>
<td><strong>Election Primaria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 1982</td>
<td>8 de Junio de 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Senator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senador de E.U.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel K. Whitehurst</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPITTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard Morgan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tom Metzger</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walter F. Buchanan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edmund G. Brown Jr.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob Hampton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gore Vidal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William F. Wertz Jr.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOTE FOR ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative in Congress – 5th District
Diputado al Congresso – Distrito #5
國會衆議員 第五議區

PHILLIP BURTON
Member of the United States Congress
Miembro del Congreso Estado Unidense

State Senator – 8th Senatorial District
Senador Estatal, Distrito #8
加州參議員 第八議區

JOHN FORAN
State Senator
Senador Estatal

Member of the Assembly – 16th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea – Distrito #16
加州衆議員 第十六議區

ART AGNOS
State Assemblyman
Asambleista Estatal

Vote for One
Vote por Uno

143

149

155
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RANDY STALLINGS</td>
<td>Human Rights Coordinator/Coordinador de Derechos Humanos</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOBBIE GRIFFITH</td>
<td>D.A. Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE RASISA</td>
<td>State Employee/Empleado Estatal</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDO E. NANNINI</td>
<td>Chairman, Assembly District/President, Asamblea del Distrito</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE L. NEWKIRK</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL NOLAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA ANN POST</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANSY PONZIO</td>
<td>Community Liaison Representative/Representante Coordinadora de la Comunidad</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVEN KRETING</td>
<td>Environmentalist, Neighborhood Worker/Especialista en Medio/Ambiente, Trabajador del Vecindario</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVE JONES</td>
<td>Legislative Assistant/Asistente Legislativo</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK TRUJILLO</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNIE O'CONNOR</td>
<td>Lieutenant, Sheriff's Dept./Lugarteniente, Dept. del Aguacil</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO ANNE MILLER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND S. (LEE) MEYERZOVE</td>
<td>Journalist/Community Representative/Periodista/Representante de la Comunidad</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK C. FITZGERAL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUDICIAL

Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9
Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9  高等法院法官  第九庭  選選一名  Vote for One

DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN
Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior  高等法院法官

Vote for One

Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1
Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1  地方法院法官  第一庭  選選一名  Vote for One

ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal  助理地方检察官

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY
Attorney/Abogada  律師

RICHARD E. BEST
Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes  助理法院委員

RICHARD TULLIS
Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente  副司法卿長

Vote for One

Superintendent of Public Instruction
Superintendente de Instrucción Pública 加州教育局長  選選一名  Vote for One

JEANNE BAIRD
Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos  教育計劃主任

GEORGIA MARSHALL
Principal/Directora  校長

RICHARD E. FERRARO
Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Miembro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles  洛杉磯教育局委員

WILSON RILES
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de instrucción Pública 加州教育局長

JANET L. ALLEN
Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comerciante 教育家／女商人

DANIEL NUSBAUM
Musician/Educador-Músico  教育家／音樂家

BILL HONIG
District Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar 校區學監

MYRON LIEBERMAN
School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar 教育局談判員

GENE PRAT
Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos 大學財政管理人

Vote for One

CITY & COUNTY

Assessor
Asesor  估稅官  選選一名  Vote for One

SAM DUCA
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo  現任

Public Defender
Defensor Público 公共辯護律師  選選一名  Vote for One

JEFF BROWN
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任

Vote for One
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends &quot;change in ownership&quot; definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state &quot;pickup&quot; estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state &quot;pickup&quot; estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
**PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>212</th>
<th>A FAVOR</th>
<th>213</th>
<th>EN CONTRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981.</td>
<td>CONTRIBUCIÓN DE $495,000,000 PARA SER SAMBDOR EN LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE PRISIONES ESTATALES.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición constitucional de que el Vicepresidente sea Presidente del Senado, Impuesto fiscal: ninguno. Impacto directo al estado.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD IMOBLIERE.</td>
<td>EXEMPCIÓN DE IMPUESTOS.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCÉS CONTRA EL SUBREMITENTE, IMPUESTO FISCAL.</td>
<td>REVOCACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANZAS. Prohibición de la libertad bajo fianza cuando el acusado sea susceptible de ser liberado por fianza.</td>
<td>PROHIBIÓN DE LA LIBERTAD BAJA FIANZA.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPUESTOS A DONACIONES Y HERencias (Propuesta Miller).</td>
<td>PROHIBICIÓN DE LA LIBERTAD BAJA FIANZA.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPUESTOS A LAS DONACIONES Y HERencias (Propuesta Regard).</td>
<td>PROHIBICIÓN DE LA LIBERTAD BAJA FIANZA.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.  

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.  

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.  

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.  

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.  

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.  

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO  
ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA - 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

三藩市縣地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

所得稅指數調整 制裁法案 規定徵收使用物
债指數數率基為調整額入所得稅徵收稅額的基
礎。財政上所受影響，加州稅收在一九八二
年約減少二億三千萬元。一九八三一九八
四年約少四億四千五百万，以後年度遞減，
加州政府稅收如有減少，其補助地方政府與學
校的經費亦相應減少。

刑事審判 修正憲法及制定法規，處理訴訟程
序，司法，釋放被告與受罪犯，及有關受害人
事件，財政上的影響，加州與地方政府所受耗
費重大，難於確定其程度。

水利設施包括水壩運河 採 “是” 票者贊成，
採 “否” 票者反對。一項法例指明中央法律計
測增加水利設施。財政上的影響，目前財政
施工，加州政府不須加稅，亦無須開減加州其
他財政的負擔。已稅前的財政建設費用一九八
一年物價計算，為約三億一億元，但用戶收
費增加，可以彌補。

重新劃分雙重議員區 採 “是” 票者贊成，採
 “否” 票者反對。一九八一年初的財政採用
四十五個雙重議員區的架構。財政上的影響，
如獲通過，加州與地方政府並無費力。如遭反
對，加州政府須耗資二十五萬元，縣區政府耗
費三十萬元。

重新劃分（加州）參議員區 採 “是” 票者贊成，
採 “否” 票者反對。一九八一年初，議會制定
一法例，改訂四十個雙重議員區的架構。財政
上的影響，如獲通過，加州與地方政府無費力並
無財政。如遭反對，加州政府須耗資三十萬
元，縣區政府耗費五十萬元。

重新劃分（加州）衞議員區 採 “是” 票者贊成，
採 “否” 票者反對。一九八一年初，議會議決
一法例，改訂八十個衞議員區的架構。財政
上的影響，如獲通過，加州與地方政府不用費力。
如遭否決，加州政府耗費四十七萬元，縣區政府
耗費十五萬元。

REDAJANTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.
Estatuós en redactar cartas de los interesados del impuesto a la renta personal usado los cambios de porcentaje comprendidos en los ítems de Proyección de Vitalidad, Impuesto Fiscal, Reducen las recaudaciones estatales en enero $250

JUSTICIA PENAL. El establecimiento de la Constitución y promueve legislaciones a respeto de los procedimientos, santos y lúbricos de las personas estudiadas y se los conduce a los crímenes. Impuesto Fiscal. Costas estatales y otras menores que se no pueden ser gerenciadas con ingresos grados de cortesía.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto “Sí” aprueba, un voto “No” rechaza, una ley que dispone instalaciones de administración de agua administradas del Proyecto del Vittel-Canal, Impuesto Fiscal. Bajo las leyes promulgadas, en no repetir asistente es en las instalaciones estatales el establecimiento de los fondos destinados a otros programas estatales. Los fondos serán administrados en suero de 1981, que son un arance de $2,100,000,000, que las costas administrativas de la construcción serán financiadas por el incremento del costo a los consumidores.

REPARTO DE LOS DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Un voto “Sí” aprueba, un voto “No” rechaza, un estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981 que aboga los límites para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impuesto Fiscal. Si es aprobada, alérgicas costos estatales a local. Si no es rechazada, costos al estadio de $250,000 y a los cédulas de $350,000.

REPARTO DE LOS DISTRITOS SENADORES. Un voto “Sí” aprueba, un voto “No” rechaza, un estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981 que reúne los límites de los 65 distritos Senadores. Impuesto Fiscal. Si es aprobada, alérgicas costos estatales a local. Si no es rechazada, costos al estadio de $370,000 y a los cédulas de $500,000.

REPARTO DE LOS DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto “Sí” aprueba, un voto “No” rechaza, un estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981 que reúne los límites de los 60 distritos de la Asamblea. Impuesto Fiscal. Si es aprobada, alérgicas costos estatales a local. Si no es rechazada, costos al estadio de $400,000 y a los cédulas de $550,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Opción</th>
<th>Pregunta o Estadística</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de probar dinero a través de la emisión de papeles sobre impuestos recaudados en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>267</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que tengan a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decídua o especial por medio del correo?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>271</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sean una contribución promedio de los salarios de los trabajadores del estado que tengan la población más grande?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>274</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los cajeros de los residentes de las predio del sistema de jubilaciones de los ancianos activos jubilados que pertenezcan al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>278</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá permitir al cajero con el sistema de jubilaciones que este recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse en el estado de la vida después de los 60 años de edad?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>281</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuales o de experiencia del sistema de jubilaciones con el permiso del actuario llevado cabo por la persona que esté dependiendo el sistema de jubilaciones?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>285</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 286 | NO | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>288</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>290</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>292</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>294</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>296</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>298</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los derechos de jubilación?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
三藩市郡地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

### 288 SI 贊成 **H**
- 4. deber reformar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado público a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Superintendentes?

### 289 NO 反对

### 292 SI 贊成 **I**
- 4. Deber reformar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado público a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los superintendentes a ser designado por la Junta de Superintendentes y la designación del servicio civil del Director General Administrador deberá ser eliminado?

### 293 NO 反对

### 296 SI 贊成 **J**
- 4. Deber ser designado el Director General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y suel estés del Servicio Civil y permitir que el Director General Administrador designe a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar el cargo del administrador?

### 297 NO 反对

### 300 SI 贊成 **K**
- 4. Deber cada miembro de la Junta de Superintendentes designar un ayudante legislativo quien liderará a cabo sus funciones al actuar del miembro?

### 301 NO 反对

### 303 SI 贊成 **L**
- 4. Deber al superintendente que recibió la mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de superintendentes de diciembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 1 de enero de 1981 y cada segunda año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que reciba la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de superintendentes el día deberá tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

### 304 NO 反对

### 307 SI 贊成 **M**
- 4. Declaración de Política: 4. Deber la Ciudad y Condados de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, adquirir una computadora para bienes digitales para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?

### 308 NO 反对

### 310 SI 贊成 **N**
- 4. Declaración de Política: 4. Deber la gente de San Francisco a las citaciones para el cargo de la Comisión de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico reduzca los precios a como estaban el 1 de diciembre de 1981 y además podrá otras medidas?

### 311 NO 反对
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes. The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
• State Assemblyman
• United States Congressman
• United States Senator
• State Senator if you live in Senate District 8
• Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
• and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
• three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
• two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
• two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year
• mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—you can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in." If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

---

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
## CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

### SAM DUCA

- **My address is**: 16 Wawona Street
- **My occupation is**: Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
- **My qualifications for office are**: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor’s Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary’s Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors’ Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

- Cyril I. Maginn, 994 California St., Merchant
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
- George R. Relly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
- Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
- Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
- Constance O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
- William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
- Jane McCaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
- Lee Yavurlu, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
- Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
- Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
- Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
- Joe Ling Jang, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
- Erma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
- Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
- H. Welton Flynn, 76 Vesuvius, Public Accounting
- Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
- Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
- James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
- Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbuckle, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
- William K. Coblentz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
- William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
- Sally B. Fimerman, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
- Lucio Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
- William Makshevik, 1177 California St., Retired
- Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
- Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
- James A. Scatena, 101 St. Elmo Way, Refrigeration Contr. Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

## CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

### JEFF BROWN

- **My address is**: 850 - 40th Avenue
- **My occupation is**: Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
- **My age is**: 38
- **My qualifications for office are**: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent. As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

- Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
- Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
- Wai Yung Brown, 830 40th Ave., Housewife
- Wilson Chang, 820 Fillbert, Business Consultant
- William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
- Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
- Carlota Textor Del Porto, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
- Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
- Diane Feinsteins, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
- Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
- Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
- Ricardo Hernandez, 80 Harper St., Exec. Secty, Rent Control Board
- Mattie J. Jackson, 324 Belvedere St., Business Manager
- Andree J. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
- Leroy King, 75 Sampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
- Cyril Maginn, 999 California, Retailer
- Edward T. Manceo, 520 Crestline Dr., Retired Public Defender
- Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
- John D. Monahan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
- Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
- Bernard A. Orsi, 500 Magellan, Businessman
- M. Lester O’Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
- Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
- Hadie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
- Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
- Tito Torres, 28th Ave., Attorney
- Yoni Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
- Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
- George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.
Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County, Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.
My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of, my work in Court; former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinosa, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1

RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyemant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jibe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I’ve handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I’ve lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION A

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

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (hereinafore) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made subject to the collection of all taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last date upon which such advertising shall be published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided; however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the first half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by tele-phone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-

terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight-thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy workforce is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Honigso
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molnari, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gagge, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Paritchan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters’ Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarriage following the death of their loved one.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hungisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaynee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:
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Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

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


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition “F” will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition “F” will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition “F” is a “no-cost,” Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral. Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章: 工作良機

你可以在六月八日三藩市選舉日工作．特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘．在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票．請往市政廳（濱街與高街）一五五室申請。
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and  
County of San Francisco  
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT  
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H

Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors’ member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Honigsto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissive for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.

2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot-Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on “K”

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED'

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

(End)
Board of Supervisors Presidency

PROPOSITION L

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisory election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehm, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylacq
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believe it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Bersice
George Evankovich, Union official
Martha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Patricia Ince, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Ora
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Temple, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940’s that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisory election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisoral election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
Fingerprint Computer

PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a re-neging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:

1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;

2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;

3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time.”

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.
Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?
If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.
But let's be sensible.
Take a look at the facts.
Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PGandE has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!
Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PGandE a penny under CPUC rules.
Proposition N could cripple electric service.
It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.
Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.
PGandE has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.
A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PGandE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.
That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.
Prop. N works against you.
Check the facts.
Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Sirvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

((The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.))

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

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

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

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

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

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
County Employees’ Retirement System (CERS), and the
surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving
spouse of a retired employee, provided that the
surviving spouse and the active or retired employee
have been married for a period of at least one year
prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the
community college district shall each contribute to the
health service fund amounts sufficient for the follow-
ing purposes, and subject to the following limitations:
(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the
health service system.
(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973,
the city and county, the school district and the com-
men college district shall contribute to the health
service system fund with respect to each of their
members an amount equal to one-half of “the average
contribution,” as certified by the health service board
in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.
For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute to the health service system fund with respect
to each of their members an amount equal to “the aver-
gage contribution,” as certified by the health ser-
vice board in accordance with the provisions of sec-
ction 8.423.
(c) Monthly contributions required from retired
persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and
retired persons participating in the system shall be
equal to the monthly contributions required from
members in the system, except that the total contribu-
tions required from retired persons who are also
covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an
amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by
such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost
to the system in providing the same health coverage
to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active
employees and retired persons as is provided for active
employee members.
(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified
School District and the San Francisco Community
College District shall not contribute to the health ser-
vie system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set
forth, on account of participation in the benefits of
the system by members’ dependents except surviving
spouses, retired persons’ dependents except surviving
spouses, persons who retired and elected not to
receive benefits from San Francisco City and County
Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees
and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any em-
ployee whose compensation is fixed in accordance
with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and
whose compensation therein includes an additional
amount for health and welfare benefits or whose
health service costs are reimbursed through any fund
established for said purpose by ordinance of the
board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the
board of education and the governing board of the
community college district annually to appropriate to
the health service system fund such amounts as are
necessary to cover the respective obligations of the
city and county, the San Francisco Unified School
District and San Francisco Community College Dis-
trict hereby imposed. Contributions to the health ser-
vie system fund of the city and county, of the school
district and of the community college district shall be
charged against the general fund or the school, utility,
bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.
The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.
If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more
propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter
receive the number of votes necessary for their adopt-
tion, notwithstanding any other provision of this
charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provi-
sions into one section. (end)

BIG BROTHERS:
IT'S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR TWO

- If you are patient and understanding.
- If your life is stable.
- If you can be a friend to a child, and
- If you have a few hours a week to share (for at least a year);
  Then you may be the perfect Big Brother.

Big Brothers is a non-profit youth service agency which matches male
volunteers to boys between the ages of 7 and 17, from father-absent homes.

Being a Big Brother offers a man the unique opportunity to contribute to his
community and himself, while providing friendship and guidance to a
young boy.

If you are over 18, and interested, call
BIG BROTHERS of San Francisco • 434-4860
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

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

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond of other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-expiring on May 15 of each year)). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
(Proposition H, Continued)

sident official of an insurance company, ((and)) one
of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or
actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine;
((and)) three members elected by the active members
of the system from among their number, and, one
member elected by the retired members of the system
from among their number. The city attorney may de-
signate, by written document filed with the board, an
assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to
act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein,
the terms of office of the members, other than the
two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term
expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years there-
after.

Each member of the health service board shall give
bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which
shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A
vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall
be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unex-
pired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be
filled by a special election to be completed within 60
days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election

is to be held and completed within six months after
such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership
on the health service board shall be nominated by a
written nomination of 20 members filed with the
registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later
than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy oc-
curs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and
shall furnish the same to all members of the system
between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive
the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and can-
vass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar
of voters shall have the power to make such regula-
tions respecting the form, distribution and canvassing
of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy
of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal
in number to the number to be elected who receive
the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.
Not more than one employee of any one department
or office may be a member of the health service
board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amend-
ment, the retired member position herein created shall
be filled concurrently with the next regular election for
an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION I

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

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a re-
tirement board, which is hereby created, and which
shall be the successor and have the powers and the
duties of the board of administration, the board of
trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the
board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retire-
ment board shall consist of ((the president)) a
member of the board of supervisors ((i)) appointed by
the board of supervisors for two years terms, ((three
members)) four members to be appointed by the
mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active
members from among their number and one member
elected by the retired members of the retirement sys-
tem from among their number. ((who shall not include
retired persons of the retirement system.)) The
members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each
hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be ex-
perienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee
pension planning, or investment portfolio management,
and shall be appointed by the mayor from among
((three)) four persons whose names shall have been
submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appoint-
ment by a committee consisting of two members each
of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association
of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board
and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Com-
merce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at
any one time, more than one appointed member who
holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the
same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office
of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((pres-
ten)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be
five years, and the terms presently in effect for ap-
pointed and elected members shall continue to apply
(()); provided, however, that the term of office of the
elected members shall expire in February in each of
the following years and every five years thereafter:
1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the
members appointed by the mayor shall expire in Fe-
bruary in each of the following years and every five
a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy
shall occur during a term of office of any member ap-
pointed by the mayor, the term of office or unex-
pired portion of the vacated term of office shall be
filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty
(60) days following the expiration of a term of office
or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office.
However, should the affirmation committee not submit
to the mayor the required name or names within 30
days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy
with an individual who meets the qualifications
specified above without committee recommendation.
Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of
an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in
accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the
administrative code of the city and county of San
Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving
the term of an elected retired member, the election of
a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar
of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by or-
dinance of the board of supervisors and said elected
retired member shall take office in February 1983 and
every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the
implementation of this section shall be paid from the
accumulated contributions of the city and county. The
members of the retirement board shall serve without
compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions
of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a
secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provi-
sions of this amendment, the board positions created
herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.

(end)
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- Text of proposed law ....................... 57

### Proposition C
Establishes a dental plan for City employees.
- Analysis ........................................ 32
- Argument ...................................... 33
- Text of proposed law ....................... 57, 58

### Proposition D
Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.
- Analysis ........................................ 34
- Argument ...................................... 35
- Text of proposed law ....................... 58, 59

### Proposition E
Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.
- Analysis ........................................ 36
- Argument ...................................... 37
- Text of proposed law ....................... 60

### Proposition F
Establishes procedural and bookkeeping changes in the City's retirement system.
- Analysis ........................................ 38
- Argument ...................................... 39
- Text of proposed law ....................... 60

### Proposition G
Gives the Retirement Board exclusive jurisdiction over investment of pension funds.
- Analysis ........................................ 40
- Argument ...................................... 41
- Text of proposed law ....................... 41

### Proposition H
Changes the composition of the Health Service Board.
- Analysis ........................................ 42
- Argument ...................................... 43
- Text of proposed law ....................... 60, 61

### Proposition I
Changes the composition of the Retirement Board and removes Manager from Civil Service.
- Analysis ........................................ 44
- Argument ...................................... 45
- Text of proposed law ....................... 61

### Proposition J
Two Retirement System administrators to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
- Analysis ........................................ 46
- Argument ...................................... 47
- Text of proposed law ....................... 47

### Proposition K
Supervisors' legislative aides to be appointed, exempt from Civil Service.
- Analysis ........................................ 48
- Argument ...................................... 49
- Text of proposed law ....................... 49

### Proposition L
Board Presidency would go to supervisory candidate who received the most votes.
- Analysis ........................................ 50
- Arguments .................................... 51, 52
- Text of proposed law ....................... 52

### Proposition M
Declares it to be City policy to purchase a fingerprint computer.
- Analysis ........................................ 53
- Arguments .................................... 54

### Proposition N
Declares opposition to recent PG&E rate increases.
- Analysis ........................................ 55
- Arguments .................................... 56
- Text of proposed law ....................... 56

## Credits

The analyses of the ballot measures which appear in this pamphlet were prepared by the San Francisco Ballot Simplification Committee, a nonpartisan group appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. The members of the committee are Judith Anderson (Chair), Nancy Yoshikari Mayeda, Cecile Michael, Jane Morrison and Dick Robertson. Chief Deputy City Attorney Thomas Toomey serves on the committee as legal advisor.

The map of the new districts on the cover was done by Lorraine Perkins.
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

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

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

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.
 Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de voto completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

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

C 第二步
请切记将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，接合於二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

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

D 第三步
请把带针之选挔针，由小孔内垂直插入，打孔投票。

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

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

E 第四步
投票选毕之后，把选票取出，放入空封袋内，票尾凸出在外。在封袋上，有空白格预备为投票人用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>東</th>
<th>美</th>
<th>競選</th>
<th>項目</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN “GOLF” TREVINO</td>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattleman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lieutenant Governor

**Vicegobernador**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position &amp; Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL WATKINS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Businessman/Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>President, Correctional Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Secretary of State

**Secretario de Estado**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position &amp; Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH R. SMITH</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Solar/Plumbing Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN HOWARD</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE KEYSER</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Businesswoman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vote for One**

**Vota por Uno**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>California State Controller</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA CLARK</td>
<td>Businessman-Educator</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>State Treasurer</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMER L. RAINS</td>
<td>Senator/Prosecuting Attorney</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WARREN CHURCH</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilado Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Senator’s Deputy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diputado de Congresistas de los E.U.A.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contador Publico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consejero de Asuntos Publicos</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUENTIN KOPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Supervisor/Lawyer</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor del Condado/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAYNE SCOTT</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Certified Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasador-Valuador Certificado del Consejo</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Equalization Deputy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diputado, Consejo de Igualeamiento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Democratic Party**

**Election Primary**

8 de junio de 1982

**State**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. WERTZ JR.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORE VIDAL</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HAMPTON</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. BUCHANAN</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM METZGER</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MORGAN</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPLETTE</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL K. WHITEHURST</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTION PRIMARIA**  
**8 DE JUNIO DE 1982**  
**SELENIAR DE E.U.**

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**  
**PRIMARY ELECTION**  
**JUNE 8, 1982**  
**UNITED STATES SENATOR**
### Representative in Congress – 6th District

**Diputado al Congress – Distrito #6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BOXER</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY J. INTINTOLI JR.</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Attorney/Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS P. MOUNTANOS</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Retired Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOEL A. DAY</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Public Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE H. RENNE</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>San Francisco Supervisor, Attorney</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United States Representative**

**Election Primaria...**

**United States Representative**

### Member of the Assembly – 16th Assembly District

**Miembro de la Asamblea – Distrito #16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>State Assemblyman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member of the Assembly**

**Primary Election...**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Stallings</td>
<td>Human Rights Coordinator/Coordinador de Derechos Humanos</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie Griffith</td>
<td>D.A. Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rabil</td>
<td>State Employee/Empleado Estatal</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido E. Nannini</td>
<td>Chairman, Assembly District/President, Asamblea del Distrito</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. Newkirk</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Nolan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ann Post</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansy Ponzo</td>
<td>Community Liaison Representative/Representante Coordinadora de la Comunidad</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Krefting</td>
<td>Environmentalist, Neighborhood Worker/Espectialista en Medio/Ambiente</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve Jones</td>
<td>Legislative Assistant/Asistente Legislativo</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Trujillo</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie O'Connor</td>
<td>Lieutenant, Sheriff's Dept./Lugarteniente, Dept. del Aguacit</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Anne Miller</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland S. (Lee) Meyerzo</td>
<td>Journalist/Community Representative/Periodista/Representante de la Comunidad</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick C. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesion del Cargo</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>Daniel H. Weinstein</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>Alfred G. Chianteelli</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>Patricia (Pat) Lucey</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Best Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Richard Tullis</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Jeanne Baird</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Marshall Principal/Directora</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E. Ferraro Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Membro</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de</td>
<td>Wilson Riles</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruccion Publica</td>
<td>Janet L. Allen</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Nusbaum Educator-Businesswoman/Educaror-Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Honig District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Superintendent</td>
<td>Myron Lieberman</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Negotiator/Negotiator de Consejo Escolar</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Prat Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asuntos Educativos</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>Samduca</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>J. B. Brown</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Vote Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>FOR: 212, AGAINST: 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>YES: 215, NO: 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES: 219, NO: 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>YES: 223, NO: 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES: 228, NO: 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES: 232, NO: 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

212 A FAVOR 贷成

213 CONTRA 反对

215 SI 贷成

216 NO 反对

219 SI 贷成

220 NO 反对

223 SI 贷成

224 NO 反对

228 SI 贷成

229 NO 反对

232 SI 贷成

233 NO 反对

新監視建築公債法案。

发行公债 $94,950,000,000，作業建築加
州監视之用。

參議院主席 芨賭憲法指定州長為參議院主
席的條款。

財政上的影響：對加州地方政府並無直接影
響。

稅制 罰罰稅率不變，修訂“累積稅”和“累
積”的定義。

保締 如犯賭定犯人知被釋放，可能使別
人的身體受到威脅時，犯人不得苟保被釋。財政
上的影響：地方政府監獄與保締監獄費用增加。

福祉制度（發放）：米制 買賣現有減
稅辦法，另訂每稅加緊政策的“積累”和“累
積”稅，其稅率相等於現有規定的等稅額。財政上
的影響：加州政府在一年八三─八三元年左右收
稅約三千三千萬元，一年八三八三元年減少三
千五百萬元，以後年度稅收減少更多。加州政
府或許每年可能節省六千萬元。加州州政
府節省稅款，其補助地方政府與學校的經費亦
相應減少。

新監視建築公債法案。

发行公債 $94,950,000,000，作業建築加
州監视之用。
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT, CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT, SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT, ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.
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REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. En esta junta estaremos de los intereses del impuesto a la renta personal mediante los cambios que perjudican a todos los contribuyentes. Reducciones en las cuotas federales se refieren a reducciones correspondientes en los pagos estatales a los gobiernos y escuelas locales.

JUSTICIA PENAL. Expone la Constitución y promulga estatutos con respecto a los procedimientos, servicios y libertad de personas acusadas y condenadas y lo que garantiza a los víctimas. Impacto fiscal: Costos estatales y locales mayores que se pueden ser previstos con algún grado de certeza.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUSIVOS CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto "SI" aprueba, un voto "NO" rechaza, una ley que destina instalaciones de canales y canales de agua adyacentes del Proyecto del Valle Central, Impacto fiscal: Hoy las necesidades presentes, un voto rechaza en los impuestos estatales a las reducciones de los fondos destinados a otros programas estatales. Los posibles costes de construcción en precios de 1981, que son en una escala de $6,100,000,000.00, costes adicionales de $1,000,000,000.00, costes adicionales de $1,000,000,000.00, costes adicionales de $1,000,000,000.00, por el incremento del costo a los consumidores.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONAL. Un voto "SI" aprueba, un voto "NO" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura del 1981 que altera las líneas para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si es rechazado, costos estatales de $350,000 y a los contribuyentes de $350,000.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un voto "SI" aprueba, un voto "NO" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura del 1981 que altera las líneas de los 40 distritos Senatoriales. Impacto fiscal: Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si es rechazado, costos estatales de $370,000 y costos a los contribuyentes de $350,000.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto "SI" aprueba, un voto "NO" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura del 1981 que altera los límites de los 80 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si es rechazado, costos estatales de $400,000 y costos a los contribuyentes de $400,000.

REASISTENCIA DE LA LÍNEA RISCONDO. Un voto "SI" aprueba, un voto "NO" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura del 1981 que altera las líneas de la línea riscondo. Impacto fiscal: Si es aprobado, ningún costo estatal o local. Si es rechazado, costos estatales de $400,000 y costos a los contribuyentes de $400,000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contributions of the city?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>263</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Debe la Junta de Superintendencia tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés contra impuestos a recoger en la manera establecida por la ley estatal a través del Decreto de la Junta de Superintendencia?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>267</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Superintendencia ordenar el Registro de Empleados que lleva a cabo cualquier alquiler municipal general, dedicado o especial por medio del correo?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>271</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Debe la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que sean una contribución promedio de los diez años del estado que tienen en la población más grande?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>274</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Debe la ciudad abonar a los empleados excedentes de los empleados activos y jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad abonará a los empleados activos y jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>278</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Se deberá permitir al empleado excedente de un empleado del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión durante un ejercicio de entre uno y dos años después de los 60 años de edad?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>281</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Debería llevar a cabo investigaciones de actuario y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el objeto de actuar de la manera que se requiera a través de una comisión y que ciertos gastos sean pagados con las contribuciones de los estudiantes?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>285</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>贊成</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los fondos de pensión para inversiones sujeta a las poderes de retención del Director?  

<p>| 111 | |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding 2 members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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← 288 SI 贊成
← 289 NO 反對

4. Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública, reduciendo dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado público a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores.

← 292 SI 贊成
← 293 NO 反對

4. Deberá cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones eliminando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado público a ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores y la designación del secretario del servicio civil del Secretario General Administrador deberá ser eliminada.

← 296 SI 贊成
← 297 NO 反對

4. Deberá ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar a cargo del Servicio Civil y para representar a dicho Administrador designar a un secretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo al alcalde del administrador.

← 300 SI 贊成
← 301 NO 反對

4. Deberá cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un asistente legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones al entero del miembro?

← 303 SI 贊成
← 304 NO 反對

4. Deberá el supervisor que recibió mayor cantidad de votos en la elección de supervisores de noviembre de 1982 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 1 de enero de 1983; cada segundo eleído de esa fecha el candidato que recibió mayor número de votos durante la última elección de supervisores electo deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta.

← 307 SI 贊成
← 308 NO 反對

4. Declaración de Política: 4. Debe ordenar lo gento de San Francisco y los residentes sobre los precios de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico y recomendando estrictamente que el Comité Estatal de Servicios Públicos reduzca los precios a cero estéticas el 1 de diciembre de 1982, y además pedir otras restricciones.

← 310 SI 贊成
← 311 NO 反對

4. Declaración de Política: 4. Debe aprobar lo gento de San Francisco a los residentes sobre los precios de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico y recomendando estrictamente que el Comité Estatal de Servicios Públicos reduzca los precios a cero estéticas el 1 de diciembre de 1982, y además pedir otras restricciones.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

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

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

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

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

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

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

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

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

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

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

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

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

**PRIMARY ELECTION** — This is an election to decide who will be a political party’s candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a **POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE** you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists **ONLY** ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions.

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**CHARTER** — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

**TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE** — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

**FISCAL YEAR** — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT** — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

**PETITION** — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

**SUPERVISORS** — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

---

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
- Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
- George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
- Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
- Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
- Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
- William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
- Jane McCrackle Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
- Lee Vayuri, 91 Camino, Retired Judge, Superior Court
- Ernest C. Ayala, 4400-20th St., Youth Director
- Jess T. Estela, 5355 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
- Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
- Joe Lung Ying, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
- Erma W. Louis, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
- Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
- H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
- Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
- Reverend John Loscalzo, Golden Gate & Parker Sts., Pres. Univ. S.F.
- Welter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
- Michael J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
- Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arballo, Exec. V.P., S.F. Exec. Park
- William K. Cohnlentz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
- William F. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
- Sally R. Ramirez, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
- Lucio Raymond, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
- William Maskoritz, 1177 California St., Retired
- Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
- Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
- Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
- Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
- Buck Bagol, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
- Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
- Wal Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
- Wilson Chang, 820 Fillert, Business Consultant
- William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
- Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
- Carlota Texidor Del Porillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
- Jess T. Estela, 5355 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
- Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
- Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
- Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
- Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secy., Rent Control Board
- Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
- Andrea I. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
- Leroy King, 537 Tampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
- Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
- Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
- Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
- John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
- Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
- Bernard A. Orell, 500 Magellan, Businessman
- M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
- Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
- Hadle Radd, 476 Jost Ave., Investigator
- Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
- Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
- Yuri Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
- Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
- George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Morun, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyeman; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Faramin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Farther, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrister, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tuft, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I’ve handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I’ve lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000. annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco's charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition "A", use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "A" means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "A".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Proposition "A" is designed to save money for the City. "A" involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition "A" does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City's cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition "A" would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition "A" is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous "rip off" of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress "wises up" and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

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

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

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues
The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle encumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinabove in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition "B" will prevent this waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition "B" will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A "YES" vote for Proposition "B" will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won't have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting "YES" for Proposition "B" will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco's taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote "YES" on Proposition "B".

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

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

OOPS!
Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote “No” on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board “may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election.”

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote “No” on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don’t be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters’ rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let’s not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O’Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based “Committee for Economic Democracy” will likely suggest that we vote by telephone “call in” next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner
Employee Dental Plan

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucichello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Partchman, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachеб, President, District #8
Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolton, Board of Supervisors

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

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees who desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dotson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaycee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

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

OOPS!

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

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

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"
On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition “F” is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition “F” will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition “F” will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition “F” is a “no-cost,” Charter Amendment.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “F”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Asho, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

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

Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller’s Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is “deposited” with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition “G” is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System’s investment portfolio.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “G” will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller’s Office, the Treasurer’s Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition “G” retains the Controller’s unquestioned authority to audit all of the System’s accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition “G” is a “no-cost” Charter Amendment.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “G”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinaro
Supervisor Richard D. Honigsto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dobson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and
County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller’s Statement on “H”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition “H”:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?

That’s right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let’s not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “I”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

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

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

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

PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisiorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Bob Guichard
George Rehmet, Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylouc
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Bargeli
Mary Anne Brennan

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concklin
Margarette Connolly
Ervin Delman
Ora Dennen
Melba Dent
Anne Deutschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Faah
Peter Fauroth
Martin Felbauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Forn Gladden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kell
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elkie Kuersten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Ethel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortenson
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefani Phelps
Al Roensch
Marvin Runan
Harriet Salerno
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seese
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Sdoboda
Richard Sesto
James Timossi
Fritz Tosa
John Van Heusden
Alexandra Yutskich
Dorothy Yutskich
Raymond Yutskich
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

• Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;

• Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

• Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;

• Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and

• Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Masha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardiman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Mortimer McIlroy, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernice Orsi
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

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

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
Fingerprint Computer

PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.
Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG&E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Sunavo, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

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

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

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
(Proposition C, Continued)

said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

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

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

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.423, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors, and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System ([.] , and the
surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviv-
ingspouse of a retired employee, provided that the
surviving spouse and the active or retired employee
have been married for a period of at least one year
prior to the death of the active or retired employee.
The city and county, the school district and the
community college district shall each contribute to the
health service fund amounts sufficient for the follow-
ing purposes, and subject to the following limitations:
(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the
health service system.
(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973,
the city and county, the school district and the com-
munity college district shall contribute to the health
service system fund with respect to each of their
members an amount equal to one-half of "the average
contribution," as certified by the health service board
in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.
For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute to the health service system fund with respect
to each of their members an amount equal to "the
average contribution," as certified by the health ser-
vice board in accordance with the provisions of sec-
tion 8.423.
(c) Monthly contributions required from retired per-
sons and the surviving spouses of active employees and
retired persons participating in the system shall be
equal to the monthly contributions required from
members in the system, except that the total contribu-
tions required from retired persons who are also
covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an
amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by
such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost
to the system in providing the same health coverage
to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active
employees and retired persons as is provided for active
employee members.
(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified
School District and the San Francisco Community
College District shall not contribute to the health ser-
vice system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set
forth, on account of participation in the benefits of
the system by members' dependents except surviving
spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving
spouses, persons who retired and elected not to
receive benefits from San Francisco City and County
Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees
and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any em-
ployee whose compensation is fixed in accordance
with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and
whose compensation therein includes an additional
amount for health and welfare benefits or whose
health service costs are reimbursed through any fund
established for said purpose by ordinance of the
board of supervisors.
It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the
board of education and the governing board of the
community college district annually to appropriate to
the health service system fund such amounts as are
necessary to cover the respective obligations of the
city and county, the San Francisco Unified School
District and San Francisco Community College Dis-
trict hereby imposed. Contributions to the health ser-
vice system fund of the city and county, of the school
district and of the community college district shall be
charged against the general fund or the school, utility,
bond or other special fund concerned.
The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.
The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.
If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more
propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter
receive the number of votes necessary for their adop-
tion, notwithstanding any other provision of this
charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provi-
sions into one section. (end)

BIG BROTHERS:
IT'S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR TWO

- If you are patient and understanding.
- If your life is stable.
- If you can be a friend to a child, and
- If you have a few hours a week to share (for at least a year);
  Then you may be the perfect Big Brother.

Big Brothers is a non-profit youth service agency which matches male
volunteers to boys between the ages of 7 and 17, from father-absent homes.

Being a Big Brother offers a man the unique opportunity to contribute to his
community and himself, while providing friendship and guidance to a
young boy.

If you are over 18, and interested, call
BIG BROTHERS of San Francisco • 434-4860
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage, to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations

The mortality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.680 Board Composition

The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-
is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION 1

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by double parentheses).

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of (the president) a member of the board of supervisors (the) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, (three members) four members to be appointed by the mayor, (and) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected from the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. (who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among (three) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to (him) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the (six) eight members, other than the (president) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply (the); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

STEP 1

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforre con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlatador Empacador Jubilado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Científico Político-Maestro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cirujano de los Arboles-Cirujópractico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinadora de Familia, Asesora (Consejera)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN &quot;GOLF&quot; TREVINO</td>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerente de Flota de Automóviles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattlemen</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granjero-Ganadero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado/Farmaceutico/Adminidor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escritora, Consultora, Ejecutiva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actor, Maestro, Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Líder de la Mayoral en el Senado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Election Date:**
- Primary Election: June 8, 1982
- General Election: June 9, 1982

**Political Party:**
- Democratic Party
- Republica Party
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEO T. McCARTHY</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature</td>
<td>加州議會議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILL WATKINS</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Minister</td>
<td>商人／牧師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA JR.</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President, Correctional Association</td>
<td>教養協會主席</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Secretary of State</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH FONG EU</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California</td>
<td>加州州務卿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KENNETH R. SMITH</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar/Plumbing Contractor</td>
<td>太陽能／水暖承包商</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HELEN HOWARD</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALICE KEYSER</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesswoman</td>
<td>女商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**ELECCION PRIMARIA 8 DE JUNIO DE 1962**

**ESTADO**

**PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 8 1962**

**STATE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Incumbent Category</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>California State Controller</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA CLARK</td>
<td>Businessman-Educator</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>State Treasurer</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMER L. RAINS</td>
<td>Senator/Prosecuting Attorney</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN CHurch</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Retired County Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>U.S. Senator's Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Public Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Public Affairs Counselor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN KOPP</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>County Supervisor/Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE SCOTT</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Board Certified Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Board Equalization Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. Wertz Jr.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gower Vidal</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hampton</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. Brown Jr.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter F. Buchanan</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Metzger</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Morgan</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Busing Advocate/Clergyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul B. Carpenter</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator, State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Caplette</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Machinist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Dubinsky-Chote</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel K. Whitehurst</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Fresno Alcalde de Fresno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representative in Congress — 6th District
**Barbara Boxer**
County Supervisor
Supervisora del Condado

**Anthony J. Intintoli Jr.**
Attorney/Educator
Abogado/Educador

**Louis P. Mountanos**
Retired Sheriff
Alguacil Jubilado

**Noel A. Day**
Public Policy Consultant
Consultor de la Política Hacia el Público

**Louise H. Renne**
San Francisco Supervisor, Attorney
Supervisora de San Francisco, Abogada

### State Senator — 8th Senatorial District
**John Foran**
State Senator
Senador Estatal

### Member of the Assembly — 16th Assembly District
**Art Agnos**
State Assemblyman
Asambleísta Estatal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Stallings</td>
<td>Human Rights Coordinator</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie Griffith</td>
<td>Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rabisa</td>
<td>State Employee/Empleado Estatal</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido E. Nannini</td>
<td>Chairman, Assembly District/President, Asamblea del Distrito</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. Newkirk</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Nolan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ann Post</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansy Ponzio</td>
<td>Community Liaison Representative</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Krefting</td>
<td>Environmental, Neighborhood Worker/Especialista en Medio/Ambiente</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve Jones</td>
<td>Legislative Assistant/Asistente Legislativo</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Trujillo</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie O'Connor</td>
<td>Lieutenant, Sheriff's Dept./Lugarteniente, Dept. del Aguací</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Anne Miller</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland S. (Lee) Meiyerzov</td>
<td>Reporter/Community Representative/Periodista/Representante de la Comunidad</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick C. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9</td>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9</td>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente de Instrucciones PúBLicas</td>
<td>JEANNE BARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Directora</td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Miembro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles</td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/State Superintendent esatial de Instrucción PúBLica</td>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator-Businesswoman/Educador-Mujer Comercial</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator, Musician/Educador-Músico</td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar</td>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor/Asesor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Prison Construction Bond Act. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>President of Senate. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Taxation, Real Property Valuation. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bail. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gift and Inheritance Taxes (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

212 A FAVOR 贳成 1
ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1961. Dispone anticipo de bonos por $480,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

213 EN CONTRA 反对

215 SI 赞成 2
PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición Constitucional de que el Vicerrector sea Presidente del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estatal o local.

216 NO 反对

219 SI 赞成 3
FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Exemtiendo la exención de "camino de casas" para excluir mejores de propiedad tomada por procedimientos de tipo de denuncia antológica. Impacto fiscal: Significativa pérdida de recaudación del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en los costos administrativos para gobiernos locales. Incremento en los costos estatales al proporcionar existencia compensatoria a las distintas asoc. locales y a ciudadanos de la comunidad. Aumento en los recaudos estatales del impuesto a la renta debido a disminuciones mas bajas del impuesto a la propiedad.

220 NO 反对

223 SI 赞成 4
FIANZA. Prohibir el libertad bajo fianza cuando la carta tiene requisitos de investigación concurrentes a la probabilidad de que la persona paseada en libertad pueda causar daño físico a otros. Impacto fiscal: Aumento al costo a los gobiernos locales de asesoramiento y medidas judiciales para fianza. Perderían al tener compensaciones si la persona fuera más tarde contenciosa o a la prisión.

224 NO 反对

228 SI 赞成 5

229 NO 反对

232 SI 赞成 6

233 NO 反对

三藩市縣地方選挙
初選 一九八二年六月八日

新監督建築公債法案。
發行公債 $495,000,000，作為建築加州監獄之用。

參議院主席 放棄憲法指定州長為參議院主席的條款。
財政上的影響：對加州成地方政府並無直接影響。

稅制 簽署課稅評估 修訂“業種稅制”的定義。避免因徵用程序而獲得的替換課稅。財政上的影響：罪稅收入損失重大，增加地方政府的行政經費。加州政府為要補貼學校與社區大學校費，其經費亦增加。由於業稅稅額降至最低，加州的所得稅收入會增加。

保釋 如法庭認定犯人如被釋放，可能使別人的身體受到傷害時，犯人不得獲釋。財政上的影響：地方政府監獄與保釋審訊費用增加。犯人稍被剝奪自由，可省去一些經費，得以補償。

禮物贈與產稅（草案：米勒） 禁止除法院外的贈與。其稅率相等於標準制的該稅額。財政上的影響：加州政府在一九八二—一九八三年內稅收減少三億六千五百萬元，以後每年稅收減少更多。加州政府每年可能有行政經費為九百萬元。加州政府稅收減少，其補貼地方政府與學校的經費亦相應減少。

禮物贈與產稅（草案：林布朗） 禁止現行 加稅制。前提為立稅制“單一”或“零稅制”。其稅率相等於標準制的課稅額。財政上的影響：加州政府在一九八二—一九八三年內稅收減少一億三千元。一九八三—一九八四年的稅收減少三億六千五百萬元，以後每年稅收減少更多。加州政府稅收如有減少，其補貼地方政府與學校的補貼經費相應減少。
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by usingfull Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.
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CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION PRIMARIA - 8 DE JUNIO DE 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>RESUMEN DE PROPUESTAS PROVISTAS PARA VOTAR EN LA ELECCIÓN DE 8 DE JUNIO DE 1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Sí - REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Se explicitan en la reforma presentes aprobados en la Ley de Rentas del Condado de 1962, que no aumentan las tasas de impuesto a la renta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>No - REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA, ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Se explicitan en la reforma presentes aprobados en la Ley de Rentas del Condado de 1962, que no aumentan las tasas de impuesto a la renta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Sí - JUSTICIA PENAL. Examinando la Constitución y proponiendo estilos con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y liberación de personas acusadas y condenadas y en lo que afecte a las víctimas, impacto fiscal. Costos estándar y locales mayores que no puedan ser probados con ningún grado de certeza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>No - JUSTICIA PENAL. Examinando la Constitución y proponiendo estilos con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y liberación de personas acusadas y condenadas y en lo que afecte a las víctimas, impacto fiscal. Costos estándar y locales mayores que no puedan ser probados con ningún grado de certeza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Sí - INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley que designa instalaciones de suministro de aguas usadas del Presidio de la Roca Central. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos de las instalaciones de suministro de agua usadas del Presidio de la Roca Central.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>No - INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley que designa instalaciones de suministro de aguas usadas del Presidio de la Roca Central. Impacto fiscal: Baja los costos de las instalaciones de suministro de agua usadas del Presidio de la Roca Central.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Sí - REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley promulgada por la Legislatura en 1961 que reúne los límites para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún cargo está sólido en local. Si se rechaza, costas al estado de $350,000 y a los candidatos de $350,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>No - REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley promulgada por la Legislatura en 1961 que reúne los límites para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún cargo está sólido en local. Si se rechaza, costas al estado de $350,000 y a los candidatos de $350,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Sí - REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley promulgada por la Legislatura en 1961 que reúne los límites para los 40 distritos Senatoriales. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún cargo está sólido en local. Si se rechaza, costas al estado de $450,000 y a los candidatos de $450,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>No - REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley promulgada por la Legislatura en 1961 que reúne los límites para los 40 distritos Senatoriales. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún cargo está sólido en local. Si se rechaza, costas al estado de $450,000 y a los candidatos de $450,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Sí - REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley promulgada por la Legislatura en 1961 que reúne los límites para los 80 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún cargo está sólido en local. Si se rechaza, costas al estado de $450,000 y a los candidatos de $450,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>No - REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto &quot;Sí&quot; aproba, un voto &quot;No&quot; rechaza, esta ley promulgada por la Legislatura en 1961 que reúne los límites para los 80 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, ningún cargo está sólido en local. Si se rechaza, costas al estado de $450,000 y a los candidatos de $450,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Opción A</th>
<th>Opción B</th>
<th>Opción C</th>
<th>Opción D</th>
<th>Opción E</th>
<th>Opción F</th>
<th>Opción G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de pagarés sujetos a impuestos a recaudar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberán permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar al Registro de Electores que llave a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decisiva o especial por medio del correo?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debe la ciudad contribuir a un plan dental para los empleados de la ciudad que están en contribución continua de los diez años del estado que tenga la población más grande?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debería la ciudad abastecer a losseguidores sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad abastecía a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá permitir el cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continua recibir dicha pensión al mismo tiempo que los 50 años de edad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberán llevarse a cabo investigaciones de actuación y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones cuyo ámbito ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el análisis del actuaría llevado a cabo por la misma cada dos años y que ciertos gestos sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Debería la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los dineros de pensones para inversiones sujetas a los poderes de revisión del Contralor?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿El gobierno debe ser el administrador de las inversiones para jubilaciones?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿El gobierno debe ser el administrador de las inversiones para jubilaciones?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿El gobierno debe ser el administrador de las inversiones para jubilaciones?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿El gobierno debe ser el administrador de las inversiones para jubilaciones?</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

| YES 298 | NO 289 |

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

| YES 292 | NO 293 |

Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

| YES 296 | NO 297 |

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

| YES 300 | NO 301 |

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?

| YES 303 | NO 304 |

Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

| YES 307 | NO 308 |

Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

| YES 310 | NO 311 |
保健服務局的組織成員是否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議會的成員則由市參議會指派?

退休局組織成員是否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議會主席退出退休局委員則改由市參議會指派，背記一總經理職為公務任命則予以免除?

退休制度的書記一總經理職位是否由退休局任命，並豁免於公務條款，該經理並無權任命一名執行書記，在他的指導下執行職務?

市參議員是否各自任命一名立法助理，在市參議員的指導下工作?

在一九八三年十一月市參議員選舉中得票最多的市參議員，應否出任市參議會主席，並在一九八三年二月八日及此後每兩年一次，在上一次市參議員的選舉中，得票最多的候選人出任市參議會主席?

政策聲明：三藩市、縣應否在一九八一至一九八三年會計年度購買一部指紋電子計算機，以備三藩市執法人員之用?

政策聲明：三藩市人民是否反對太平洋電公司最近的加價，並敦促公用事業委員會把電費降低到一九八一年十二月一日的水平，並要求採取其他糾正行動?
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
  • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
  • are a citizen of the United States.
  • are a resident of California, and
  • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—If I have been convicted of a crime, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say "Independent" or "I don’t want to tell."

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes. The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must register again.

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
  • State Assemblyman
  • United States Congressman
  • United States Senator
  • State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
  • Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
  • and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
  • three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
  • two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
  • two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 9)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
  • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
  • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
  • That you need to vote early
  • your registered voting address
  • the address where you want the ballot mailed
  • then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed next to your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party’s candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polling place to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR
ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA
My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave, Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCluskie Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Vavrus, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4400-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Hess, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St, Restaurant Owner
Emma W. Louie, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mello, 310 Arballo, Exec. V.P.S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coble, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Fomarin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymond, 706 Paxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Mokovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR
PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN
My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bago, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlota Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Freis, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secy, Rent Control Board
Mattie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea J. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Santa Ana, Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nico, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Orsi, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadle Reid, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.
Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tannay, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gynant; former Assessor Joseph Tinneny; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Faramin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issu-ance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A "YES" vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco's charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition "A", use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "A" means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "A".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Proposition "A" is designed to save money for the City. "A" involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition "A" does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City's cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition "A" would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition "A" is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition "A".

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It's an outrageous "rip off" of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress "wises up" and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.306 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for any fiscal year in anticipation of the collection, at the close of such fiscal year, of the legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((herein)) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of the income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bond indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness were issued and such levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonds or indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by:  Supervisor Harry G. Britt  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it’s possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

JUNE 5, 6 & 7  
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress  
(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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MAIL BALLOT ELECTIONS

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Theft from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot casts makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employee Dental Plan

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition “C” was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition “C”, there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition “C” will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition “C”, as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what’s important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It’s a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like “PULLING TEETH” to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City’s contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee’s death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.”

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category "Surviving Spouse" and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Phillip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Melinari, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Paritchian, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee’s surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee’s spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and
County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city’s general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”
On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost," Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Defon
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is 'deposited' with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment. VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by:
Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:
Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition "H":

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “H”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor’s appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board.”

How Supervisors Voted on “I”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.

2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City’s costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

(end)
PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votergetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write into the law

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.),
Melba Ahstrom,
Frank Atello,
Cheryl Arenson,
Robert Arenson,
Duke Armstrong,
Alfred Bayliss,
Robert Batchelor,
Joseph Bell,
Adeline Borgelt,
Mary Anne Brennan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votergetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votergetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votergetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votergetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Burvice
George Eskenavich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Mortimer McNearney, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Ilene Orsi
Letter O'Shea
John Smith, Union official
Supervisor Ted Temple
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARter AMENDMENT PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisors election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK.
SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller’s Statement on “N”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

“Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time.”

How Prop N Got On The Ballot

Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG and E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Swuaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes."

((The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.))

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by (double parenthesis).

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall select such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (Double parentheses).

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fee schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until approved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons, and the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system, by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors, and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION D**

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).**

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System ((j)), and the
surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviv-
ing spouse of a retired employee, provided that the
surviving spouse and the active or retired employee
have been married for a period of at least one year
prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the
community college district shall each contribute to the
health service fund amounts sufficient for the follow-
ing purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the
health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973,
the city and county, the school district and the com-
munity college district shall contribute to the health
service system fund with respect to each of their
members an amount equal to one-half of "the average
contribution," as certified by the health service board
in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute to the health service system fund with respect
to each of their members an amount equal to "the
average contribution," as certified by the health ser-
vice board in accordance with the provisions of sec-
tion 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired per-
sons and the surviving spouses of active employees and
retired persons participating in the system shall be
equal to the monthly contributions required from
members in the system, except that the total contribu-
tions required from retired persons who are also
covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an
amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by
such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each
fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost
to the system in providing the same health coverage
to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active
employees and retired persons as is provided for active
employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified
School District and the San Francisco Community
College District shall not contribute to the health ser-
service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set
forth, on account of participation in the benefits of
the system by members' dependents except surviving
spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving
spouses, persons who retired and elected not to
receive benefits from San Francisco City and County
Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees
and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any em-
ployee whose compensation is fixed in accordance
with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter
and whose compensation therein includes an additional
amount for health and welfare benefits or whose
health service costs are reimbursed through any fund
established for said purpose by ordinance of the
board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the
board of education and the governing board of the
community college district annually to appropriate to
the health service system fund such amounts as are
necessary to cover the respective obligations of the
city and county, the San Francisco Unified School
District and San Francisco Community College Dis-
trict hereby imposed. Contributions to the health ser-
service system fund of the city and county, of the school
district and of the community college district shall be
charged against the general fund or the school, utility,
bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on
November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on
June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more
propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter
receive the number of votes necessary for their adop-
tion, notwithstanding any other provision of this
charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provi-
sions into one section. (end)

---

BIG BROTHERS:
IT'S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR TWO

- If you are patient and understanding.
- If your life is stable.
- If you can be a friend to a child, and
- If you have a few hours a week to share (for at least a year);
  Then you may be the perfect Big Brother.

Big Brothers is a non-profit youth service agency which matches male
volunteers to boys between the ages of 7 and 17, from father-absent homes.

Being a Big Brother offers a man the unique opportunity to contribute to his
community and himself, while providing friendship and guidance to a
young boy.

If you are over 18, and interested, call
BIG BROTHERS of San Francisco • 434-4860
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by (double parenthesis).

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEST OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; (two) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 (each of the following years) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in (each of the following years) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of (the president) a member of the board of supervisors (the) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, (three members) four members to be appointed by the mayor, (and) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. (who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among (the) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to (him) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the (six) eight members, other than the (president) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply (the); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment or by election. The mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
DEMOCRATS: Support your party NOW!

Democracy does not work without thousands of contributors and participants.

Clip out and mail this coupon today:

Enclosed is my contribution of  □ $5  □ $10  □ $15  □ $25  □ More_____.

☐ I will volunteer in the office.
☐ I will volunteer to register voters.
☐ I will volunteer as a door-to-door canvasser for the Democratic Party.

NAME

ADDRESS

ZIP

PHONE

Mail this coupon to: S.F. Democratic Party
760 Market Street, Room 529
San Francisco, CA 94102

Thank you,
Agar Jaicks,
Chair, S.F. Democratic Central Committee
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTER DE IMPRENTA Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
正楷書寫姓名 Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE: JUNE 8, 1982
I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

Por la presente solicito una balota de Volante Ausente para la elección indicated arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIEME LA BALOTA A: 請將選票寄給本人下址:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>FECHA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Zip Code

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
申請人簽名

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ______________ 19___.
My residence address is ________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambio el ______________ 19___.
Mi dirección es ________________________

NOTA: Un votante que se cambie dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambie antes de los 29 días anteriores a la elección y que no se registre antes de la fecha límite para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ENVIAR A:
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 3 JUNIO,
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

申请缺席選票必須在選舉日七日之前
前，六月一日星期二下午五時前由
選民註冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
San Francisco
Voter Information Pamphlet

Primary Election
June 8, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 4

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#—Area EAST of (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

Jay Patterson
Registrar of Voters
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del “Votomatic.”

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动机将整张选票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
请确保将选票插入时，票尾之二孔，结合于二红点之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL [STRAIGHT UP], PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfora con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请把带鉛之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del “Votomatic” y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空白袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRATIC PARTY</th>
<th>ELECCION PRIMARIA 6 DE JUNIO DE 1982</th>
<th>ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA 6 DE JUNIO DE 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Gobernador</td>
<td>Gobernador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>省长</td>
<td>省长</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>美国民主党</td>
<td>美国民主党</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>政治学学者—教师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Científico Politico-Maestro</td>
<td>政治学学者—教师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor</td>
<td>森林外科医生—脊椎按摩师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cirujano de los Arboles-Chiropractico</td>
<td>森林外科医生—脊椎按摩师</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
<td>家庭协调员，咨询员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinadora de Familia, Asesora (Consejera)</td>
<td>家庭协调员，咨询员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
<td>洛杉矶市长</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcalde, Los Angeles</td>
<td>洛杉矶市长</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comerciante</td>
<td>商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>看守人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portero</td>
<td>看守人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN “GOLF” TREVINO</td>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager</td>
<td>汽车队管理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerente de Flota de Automóviles</td>
<td>汽车队管理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattlemen</td>
<td>农夫—牧夫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granjero-Ganadero</td>
<td>农夫—牧夫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator</td>
<td>律师／药剂师／管理人员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abogado/Farmacéutico/Administrador</td>
<td>律师／药剂师／管理人员</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>作家，顾问，总经理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escritora, Consultora, Ejecutiva</td>
<td>作家，顾问，总经理</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td>演员，教师，商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actor, Maestro, Comerciante</td>
<td>演员，教师，商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader</td>
<td>参议院多数党领袖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Líder de la Mayoría en el Senado</td>
<td>参议院多数党领袖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer</td>
<td>退休包装工</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlatador, Empacador Jubilado</td>
<td>退休包装工</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DÉMOCRATIQUE</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA 2 DE JUNIO DE 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicegobernador</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Consultor, Ejecutivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL WATKINS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Businessman/Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comerciante/Pastor Protestante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>President, Correctional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presidente, Asociación Correccional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asambleísta, de la Legislatura de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary of State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Secretario de Estado</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH R. SMITH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Solar/Plumbing Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solar/Fontanero (Plomero) Contratista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN HOWARD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comisionada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE KEYSER</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Businesswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer Comerciante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaría de Estado, Estado de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for One
Vote por Uno
請選一名
CONTROLLER

IRA CLARK
Businessman-Educator
Comerciante-Educador
商人－教育家

KENNETH CORY
California State Controller,
Contralor del Estado de California
加州審計官

Treasurer

JESSE M. UNRUH
State Treasurer,
Tesorero Estatal
加州司庫

Attorney General

OMER L. RAINS
Senator/Prosecuting Attorney
Senador/Abogado Fiscal
參議員／檢察官

JOHN VAN DE KAMP
District Attorney, Los Angeles County
Procurador del Distrito del Condado de Los Angeles
洛杉磯縣郡地方檢察官

VOTE FOR ONE
VOTE POR UNO
請選一名
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State Board of Equalization – 1st District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento – Distrito #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>加州平權局委員 第一議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>請選一名</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conway Collis</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Goldstein</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brown Jr.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quentin Kopp</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonel Monterey</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Scott</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. John Shimmon</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Church</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voting Information**

**Election Primary**
JUNE 8, 1982

**Democratic Party**

**Estado**

**State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conway Collis</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Goldstein</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brown Jr.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quentin Kopp</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonel Monterey</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Scott</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. John Shimmon</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Church</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupation**

- Conway Collis: U.S. Senator’s Deputy, Diputado de Congresistas de los E.U.A.
- Julian Goldstein: Public Accountant, Contador Publico
- William Brown Jr.: Public Affairs Counselor, Consejero de Asuntos Publicos
- Quentin Kopp: County Supervisor/Lawyer, Supervisor del Condado/Abogado
- Leonel Monterey: Consultant
- Wayne Scott: Board Certified Appraiser, Tasador-Vauidor Certificado del Consejo
- A. John Shimmon: Board Equalization Deputy, Diputado, Consejo de Igualamiento
- Warren Church: Retired County Supervisor, Jubilado Supervisor del Condado
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Senator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GORE VIDAL</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HAMPTON</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. BUCHANAN</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM METZGER</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MORGAN</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPLETTE</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL K. WHITEHURST</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. WERTZ JR.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United States Senator**

**Senador de Estados Unidos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>美國參議員</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GORE VIDAL</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HAMPTON</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. BUCHANAN</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM METZGER</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MORGAN</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPLETTE</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL K. WHITEHURST</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. WERTZ JR.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTION PRIMARIA**

8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

PRIMARY ELECTION

JUNE 8, 1982

**UNITED STATES SENATOR**
Representative in Congress – 5th District
Diputado al Congress – Distrito #5

PHILLIP BURTON
Member of the United States Congress
Miembro del Congreso Estado Unidense

Vote for One
Vote por Uno

Member of the Assembly – 17th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea – Distrito #17

WILLIE L. BROWN JR.
Speaker, California Assembly
Orador, Asamblea de California
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GWENN CRAIG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN F. CROWLEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUREEN CHEW</td>
<td>Educator/Educadora</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY GRIFFIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE A. WILSON</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY VAIL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA SAMANTHA YRUEGAS</td>
<td>Commissioner, Recreation-Parks/Comisionada, Recreation-Parques</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRI HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant/Consejero</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDY L. HUFFMAN</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Organizadora Política</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE BRADY</td>
<td>D.A. Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERNARD F. BRADY</td>
<td>Estate Administrator/Administrador Estatal</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAC克斯</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHANIE MISCHAK</td>
<td>Personnel Analyst/Analizadora de Personal</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Specialist/Especialista en Justicia Criminal</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9</td>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONG</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensor Público</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
### Measures Submitted to Vote of Voters
### State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**

**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
### PROPÓSITOS ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Propósito</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Contra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Acta de donación para la construcción de nuevas prisiones de 1961.</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Presidente del Senado, fuerza la disposición Constitucional de que el Viceministro sea Presidente del Senado. Impacto local: Ningún impacto directo.</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Fijación de impuestos. Valuación de propiedad inmueble.</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Finanzas. Prohibición de dación en pago para la evitación de comisiones.</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Impuestos a donaciones y herencias (Fondo Militar).</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Impuestos a las donaciones y herencias (Fondo Recaudaciones).</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA. Electo se modifica constituyendo de las modificaciones del impuesto a la renta personal estando las cantidades de percepción consistente del Impuesto de Renta el Sandwich. El Impuesto se modifica reduciendo los límites establecidos en el artículo 82 de la reforma. Rango Fiscal. Modifican los límites establecidos en el registro correspondiente en las páginas respectivas a los gastos medianos de cuentas bancarias y cuentas de correos.

JUSTICIA PENAL. Eximen a la Constitución y promueven costas con respecto a los gastos y la relación del proceso que implica el intercambio de personas acusadas y condenadas y en lo que contribuya a los objetivos del impacto fiscal. Costas antojadas y locales mayores que un marco ser pagadas con el valor de los derechos.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Se aprueba una reforma aprobada por la Legislatura de 1981 que modifica los límites de las 45 distritos congresionales. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que modifica el eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.

REDESISTIÓN. DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Se aprueba un eno que rediseña la gestión de la hidráulica de agua del aceite de la Asamblea Nacional. Impacto Fiscal. Si se aprueba, el costo será de US$ 320,000 y a los costos de US$ 320,000.
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### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
### PRIMARY ELECTION - JUNE 8, 1982

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**
**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
263 SI 贊成 ¿Debería la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de pedir dinero a través de la emisión de papeles de renta impuestos a reserar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal o según el decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?

264 NO 反対

267 SI 贊成 ¿Debería permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que lleno a cada candidato electoral municipal general, declarar o aprobar por medio del correo?  

268 NO 反対

271 SI 贊成 ¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a un plan de salud para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los dos candidatos del estado que ganen la elección más grande?

272 NO 反対

274 SI 贊成 ¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los ciudadanos subvencionables de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvencionara a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

275 NO 反対

278 SI 贊成 ¿Debería permitir el cambio subvencionable de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al comenzar de nuevo durante los 65 años de edad?

279 NO 反対

281 SI 贊成 ¿Debería hacerse una investigación de octubre y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como se ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el objetivo del análisis hecho por la Junta de Jubilaciones en los últimos dos años y que sean gastar esos pagos con las contribuciones de la ciudad?

282 NO 反対

285 SI 贊成 ¿Debería la Junta de Supervisores tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los fondos de las pensiones para inversiones junto a los poderes de revisión del Controlador?

286 NO 反対
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of the Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remedial actions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
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288 SI 贊成
289 NO 反对

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反对

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反对

300 SI 贊成
301 NO 反对

303 SI 贊成
304 NO 反对

307 SI 贊成
308 NO 反对

310 SI 贊成
311 NO 反对

保健服務局的組織成員應否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議員的成員則由市參議員指派？

退休局組織成員應否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退休職工，由已退休的成員選出，而市參議員主席出任退休局委員則改由市參議員指派。這樣一名經理職位公務任命則予以保留？

退休制度的名額——經理職位應否由退休局任命，並豁免於公務訓條。該經理並有權任命一名執行書記，在他的領導下執行職務？

市參議員應否各自任命一名立法助理，在市參議員的指導下工作？

在一九八零年十一月市參議員選舉中得票最多的市參議員，是否出任市參議會主席，並在一九八三年一月八日及以後每兩年一次，在上一次市參議員的選舉中，得票最多的候選人出任市參議會主席？

政策聲明： 三藩市，縣應否在一九八二一八三年會計年度購進一部指紋電子計算機，以備三藩市執法人員之用？

政策聲明： 三藩市人民應否反對太平洋電公司最近的加價，並要求公用事業委員會把加價恢復到一九八一年十二月一日起的水平，並要求採取其他糾正行動？
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
- are at least 18 years of age on election day.
- are a citizen of the United States.
- are a resident of California, and
- are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—If I have been convicted of a crime, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must register again.

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
- State Assemblyman
- United States Congressman
- United States Senator
- State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
- Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
- and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
- two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year
- mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
- that you need to vote early
- your registered voting address
- the address where you want the ballot mailed
- then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed next to your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.

---

**RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER**  
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT. — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polling place to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor’s Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary’s Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors’ Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Cyril J. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Vaviris, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Jesse T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Louise, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Reverend John LoSchiavo, Golden Gate & Parker Sts., Pres., Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Ruddell, 140 Cherry, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Ave., Anorney
William T. Reed, 2135 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Emanuir, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Fried, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender’s Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlota Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Secy., Rent Control Board
Maggie A. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea J. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nieco, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Orli, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O’Shea, 2683 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Redd, 476 Joost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.
Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County, Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.
My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Cutelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.
Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:
- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.
As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.
Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyemant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeannie Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years. I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders. criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal govern-

ment, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (herein)) hereinafter (in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year

in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which such money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 37)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller's Statement on "B"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election."

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Employee Dental Plan

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy workforce is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hwang
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS N PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category "Surviving Spouse" and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Honigsto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by: Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, Board of Supervisors
Walter B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Honigsto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Farichon, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachol, President, District #8
Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dohan, Board of Supervisors

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F

Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city's general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city's general fund.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Honigsto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition "H":

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

---

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

---

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
INO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by:  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
             Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
             Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J

Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "J"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE

Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissive for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.

2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board,

the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

(end)
PROPOSITION L

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisiorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisiorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

The full legal text of Prop L appears on page 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehnert,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Avello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Bayless
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgeit
Mary Anne Brennan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:
- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbogelita
Al Borvice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Franks, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Mortimer McAndrew, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Neider
Bernie Orsi
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1952, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.
Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:

1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;

2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;

3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on “N”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG&E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.
Check the facts.
Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaico, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this charter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((Double parentheses)).

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fee schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until approved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, ((exclusive of dental or optical care)) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
(Proposition C, Continued)
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in sections 8.427, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors(ies), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
(Proposition D, Continued)
County Employees' Retirement System (C), and the
surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviv-
ing spouse of a retired employee, provided that the
surviving spouse and the active or retired employee
have been married for a period of at least one year
prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the
community college district shall each contribute to the
health service fund amounts sufficient for the follow-
ing purposes, and subject to the following limitations:
(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the
health service system.
(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973,
the city and county, the school district and the com-
Community college district shall contribute to the health
service system fund with respect to each of their
members an amount equal to one-half of "the average
contribution," as certified by the health service board
in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fis-
cal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute to the health service system fund with respect
to each of their members an amount equal to "the
average contribution," as certified by the health ser-
vice board in accordance with the provisions of sec-
section 8.423.
(c) Monthly contributions required from retired per-
sons and the surviving spouses of active employees and
retired persons participating in the system shall be
equal to the monthly contributions required from
members in the system, except that the total contribu-
tions required from retired persons who are also
covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an
amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by
such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for
the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each
fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school
district and the community college district shall con-
tribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost
to the system in providing the same health coverage
to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active
employees and retired persons as is provided for active
employee members.
(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified
School District and the San Francisco Community
College District shall not contribute to the health ser-
service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set
forth, on account of participation in the benefits of
the system by members' dependents except surviving
spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving
spouses, persons who retired and elected not to
receive benefits from San Francisco City and County
Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees
and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any em-
ployee whose compensation is fixed in accordance
with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and
whose compensation therein includes an additional
amount for health and welfare benefits or whose
health service costs are reimbursed through any fund
established for said purpose by ordinance of the
board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the
board of education and the governing board of the
Community college district annually to appropriate to
the health service system fund such amounts as are
necessary to cover the respective obligations of the
city and county, the San Francisco Unified School
District and San Francisco Community College Dis-
trict hereby imposed. Contributions to the health ser-
vice system fund of the city and county, of the school
district and of the community college district shall be
charged against the general fund or the school, utility,
bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.
The amendments of this section contained in the
proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on
June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.
If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more
propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter
receive the number of votes necessary for their adop-
tion, notwithstanding any other provision of this
charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provi-
sions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviv-

ing spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEST OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
(Proposition H, Continued)

sident official of an insurance company, one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years. (one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years thereafter.

Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member.

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of (the president), a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for two years terms, (three members) four members to be appointed by the mayor, (and) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. (who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among (four persons whose names shall have been submitted to (him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the (six) eight members, other than the (president) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. (Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.

(end)
DEMOCRATS: Support your party NOW!

Democracy does not work without thousands of contributors and participants.

Clip out and mail this coupon today:

Enclosed is my contribution of □ $5 □ $10 □ $15 □ $25 □ More______.
□ I will volunteer in the office.
□ I will volunteer to register voters.
□ I will volunteer as a door-to-door canvasser for the Democratic Party.
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760 Market Street, Room 829
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Agar Jaick,
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APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
   LETRAS DE IMPRENTA Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT. 
   正楷書寫姓名 Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE JUNE 8, 1982
   I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election 
   indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
   ENVIÉME LA BALOTA A:
   請將選票寄給本人下址：

   Zip Code
   Area Postal
   帳區號碼

   DATE: ____________________________ 日期
   FECHA: ____________________________

   Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
   Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
   申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

5. I prefer election materials in English
   Prefiero materiales electorales en español
   我欲索取中文選舉資料
   如果你已遷居

   6. □ I listed SE HA CAMBIADO
      Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y 
      reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que 
      aparece en su declaración jurada de registro. 
    Me cambie el _____________________ de 19 .
    Mi dirección es: _____________________ Area Postal

   NOTA: A voter moving within 28 days prior 
   to this election may obtain an ab- 
   sentee ballot. A voter moving more 
   than 28 days prior to this election 
   and who did not re-register prior to 
   the registration closing date for this 
   election is not eligible to vote.

   SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
   Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y 
   reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que 
   aparece en su declaración jurada de registro. 
   Un votante que se cambie antes de los 28 días anteriores 
   de la elección no puede obtener balote ausente.
   Un votante que se cambie antes de los 28 días anteriores 
   de la elección y que no se registro antes 
   de la fechas final para registrarse de esta 
   elección no puede votar.

   MAIL TO:
   ENVIAR A:
   ABSENT VOTING SECTION
   REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
   ROOM 158, CITY HALL
   SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

   APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN 
   REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M. 
   TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982.
   7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

   LA SOLICITUD DEBE RESEGUIRSE EN LA OFICINA
   DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
   DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 3 JUNIO 
   EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA 
   ELECCION.

   申請缺席選票必須在選舉日七日之前
   順序
   六月一日星期二下午五時前
   選民註冊登記處收到此申請表箇

   DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
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Democratic Party
17th Assembly District
5th Congressional District
8th Senatorial District

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
# — Area EAST of (solid lines)
#17 — Area BETWEEN (solid lines)
#19 — Area WEST of (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3 — Area NORTH of (virgule lines)
#8 — Area SOUTH of (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5 — All the UNSHADED area
#6 — All the SHADED area

Jay Patterson
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PROPOSITION B
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Argument .......... 33
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PROPOSITION E
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Text of proposed law .......... 61

PROPOSITION J
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Argument .......... 47
Text of proposed law .......... 47

PROPOSITION K
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Analysis .......... 48
Argument .......... 49
Text of proposed law .......... 49

PROPOSITION L
Board Presidency would go to supervisory candidate who received the most votes.
Analysis .......... 50
Arguments .......... 51, 52
Text of proposed law .......... 52

PROPOSITION M
Declares it to be City policy to purchase a fingerprint computer.
Analysis .......... 53
Arguments .......... 54

PROPOSITION N
Declares opposition to recent PG&E rate increases.
Analysis .......... 55
Arguments .......... 56
Text of proposed declaration .......... 56
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE: IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

Note: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

STEP 1

USING BOTH HANDS INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.

Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
请双手持票向自动機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE Stub OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
请确认将选票插入時，票尾之二孔，契合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP), PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perforé con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
请将選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入行孔投票。

STEP 4

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE Stub SHOWING.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y pángala bajo el cierre del sobre.

E 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸在外。
在封袋上，有空白格須填寫投票人姓名。

3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor/Gobernador/州長</th>
<th>Vote for One/Vote por Uno</th>
<th>聘選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher/Científico Político-Maestro 政治科學學者－教師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor/Cirujano de los Arboles-Chiropráctico 樹木外科－指療師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor/Coordinadora de Familia, Asesora (Consejera) 家庭協調員，諮詢員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles/Alelce, Los Angeles 洛杉磯市長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Comerciante 商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian/Portero 監守人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN &quot;GOLF&quot; TREVINO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager/Gerente de Flota de Automóviles 汽車隊管理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer-Cattleman/Granjero-Ganadero 農夫－牧夫</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator Abogado/Farmacéutico/Administrador 律師／藥劑師／管理人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive/Escritora, Consultora, Ejecutiva 作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman/Actor, Maestro, Comerciante 演員，教師，商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Majority Leader/Líder de la Mayoría en el Senado 參議院多數黨領袖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Packer/Enlata dor, Empacador Jubilado 退休包裝工人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vicegobernador</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</strong></td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive Writer, Consultor, Ejecutivo 作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escritor, Consultor, Ejecutivo 作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILL WATKINS</strong></td>
<td>Businessman/Minister  商人／牧師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comerciante/Pastor Protestante  商人／牧師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA JR.</strong></td>
<td>President, Correctional Association  教養協會主席</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidente, Asociación Correccional  教養協會主席</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEO T. MCCARTHY</strong></td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature  加州議會衆議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asambleísta, de la Legislatura de California  加州議會衆議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary of State</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secretario de Estado</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KENNETH R. SMITH</strong></td>
<td>Solar/Plumbing Contractor  太陽能／水暖承包商</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solar/Fontanero (Plomería) Contratista  太陽能／水暖承包商</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HELEN HOWARD</strong></td>
<td>Commissioner  委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comisionada  委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALICE KEYSER</strong></td>
<td>Businesswoman  女商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer Comerciante  女商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH FONG EU</strong></td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California  加州州務卿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California  加州州務卿</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>IRA CLARK</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>OMER L. RAINS</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN KOPP</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE SCOTT</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN CHURCH</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### United States Senator

**Senator de Estados Unidos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>請選一名</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GORE VIDAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HAMPTON</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER F. BUCHANAN</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM METZGER</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MORGAN</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL B. CARPENTER</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY CAPLETTE</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY DUBINSKY-CHOTE</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL K. WHITEHURST</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM F. WERTZ JR.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**民主黨**

**民主黨**

**ELECTION PRIMARIA 6 DE JUNIO DE 1982**

**SENADOR DE E.U.**

**DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

**PRIMARY ELECTION JUNE 8, 1982**

**UNITED STATES SENATOR**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress — 5th District</td>
<td>PHILLIP BURTON, Member of the United States Congress</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator — 8th Senatorial District</td>
<td>JOHN FORAN, State Senator, Senator Estatal</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly — 17th Assembly District</td>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Speaker, California Assembly, Orador, Asamblea de California</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwenn Craig</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Crowley</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulu M. Carter</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureen Chew</td>
<td>Educator/Educadora</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Belisle Daley</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Griffin</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence A. Wilson</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Vail</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Samantha Yruegas</td>
<td>Commissioner, Recreation-Parks/Comisionada, Recreación-Parques</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terru Huqunin</td>
<td>Consultant/Consejero</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Huberman</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy L. Huffman</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Organizadora Política</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Brady</td>
<td>D.A. Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard F. Brady</td>
<td>Estate Administrator/Administrador Estatal</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan J. Bierman</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Kilroy</td>
<td>Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agar Jaicks</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Mischak</td>
<td>Personnel Analyst/Analizadora de Personal</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise A. Minnick</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Specialist/Especialista en Justicia Criminal</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**JUDICIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1</td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCY</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent de Instrucción Publica</td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CITY & COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
1. NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.

   For: 212
   Against: 213

2. PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.

   Yes: 215
   No: 216

3. TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends "change in ownership" definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

   Yes: 219
   No: 220

4. BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.

   Yes: 223
   No: 224

5. GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state "pickup" estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

   Yes: 228
   No: 229

6. GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state "pickup" estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

   Yes: 232
   No: 233
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## PROPOSICIONES ESTATALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>VOTO</th>
<th>DETALLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>ACTA DE DEBT PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRECIOSO DE 1981. Dinego emiten de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>CONTRA</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS. VALORACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Extingue la ficción de &quot;compra de terreno&quot; para evitar reemplazos de propiedad (tamaño por gravamen del tipo de daño ambiental. Impacto fiscal. Significativo pérdida de recaudación de impuestos a la propiedad y aumentos en los costos administrativos para gobernar la tenencia. Incrementa en los costos estatales al proporcionar estabilidad y seguridad de las distintas áreas locales y de titulares de la comunidad. Aumenta en los costos estatales del Impuesto a la tierra debido a reducciones en bajos impuestos a la propiedad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贳成</td>
<td>FIANZA. Puede dar libertad bajo fianza cuando la carta tiene resoluciones de Investigación para su libertad puede ser dada fines a librar, impacto fiscal. Aumenta el costo a los gobiernos locales de manejar características y presión judicial para fianza. Permanecen abiertas opciones para si la persona fuera más tarde acusada en la cancelación o la prisión.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPUESTA DE DECORPUE (Propuesta Jackson): Crear un sistema de servicio de residencias convencionales. Su costo es inferior a la reforma fiscal. Impacto fiscal. Aumenta el costo de los gobiernos locales. Las reducciones en los impuestos reflejarían en reducciones correspondientes en los pagos estatales.
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. "Yes" vote approves, "No" vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.
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7. REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA, ESTADO DE INICIATIVA. Esta iniciativa propone eliminar los anejo de impuestos a la renta que se imponen sobre las personas que ganan menos de $33,000 anuales. El Petitorio del Comité para Sufragar la iniciativa. Factor Fiscal. Reducir la base imponible en un millón de dólares en 1983-84, en un millón doscientos mil dólares en 1984-85, y en un millón cuatrocientos mil dólares en 1985-86. Reducción en las tasas estatales resultantes en reducciones correspondientes en las tasas estatales a los gobiernos y escuelas locales.

8. JUSTICIA PENAL. Enmienda la Constitución y promulga estatutos con respecto a los procedimientos, sentencias y la gravedad de penas en los delitos de deudores, tras los límites de los delitos de deudores, y se establece un sistema de impuestos. Impuesto Fiscal: Costas estatales y locales mayores que no pueden ser gravados con ningún grado de certidumbre.

9. INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, una ley que establece instalaciones de almacenamiento de agua adicional en el sistema del Valle Central, Impacto Fiscal: Bajo los marcos presentes, se en registros aumentarán en las tasas estatales al reducir rentas de los tiempos de obra de programas estatales. Las propuestas de construcción en el sistema de almacenamiento de agua adicional para la industria. Costos adicionales que se desaconsejan, serán financiados por el incremento del costo a los consumidores.

10. REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS CONGRESSIONALES. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, un estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que establece los límites de los 45 distritos Congresionales, Impacto Fiscal: Si es aprobarán, ningún costo estará a estatal. Si es rechazado, el costo de $20,000,000 al costo de $350,000.

11. REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS SENADORIALES. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, un estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que establece los límites de los 45 distritos Senatoriales, Impacto Fiscal: Si es aprobarán, ningún costo estará a estatal. Si es rechazado, el costo de $370,000,000 y a los candidatos de $250,000.

12. REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, estatuto promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que establece los límites de las áreas de la Asamblea, Impacto Fiscal: Si es aprobarán, ningún costo estará a estatal. Si es rechazado, el costo de $400,000,000 y a los candidatos de $500,000.

三藩市縣地方選挙
初選 一九八二年六月八日

所得和指數調整 削減財政收入
所得和指數調整 的提議，財政 ISA 要求使用物
理指數百分率為調整個人所得稅提進稅額的基礎。
財政上所受影響：加州在1981-82年中減少二億三千萬元。
一九八三年至四
年約少二億四千五百萬元，以後年年少減少，
加州政府稅收如何減少，其補貼地方政府與學
校的經費亦相應減少。

刑事審判 修改變法及制定法規，處理訴訟程
序，判決。釋放被告與罪犯，及有關受害人
事件。財政上的影響，加州與地方政府所受耗
費重大，難於確定其程度。

水利設備包括外圍運河 投“是”票即贊成，
投“否”票即反對。一項例法指定中央水道計
劃增加水利設施。財政上的影響，照目前政策
實施，加州政府不需加稅，亦無須削減加州其
他計劃的經費。已核准的計劃建築費約一九八
一年物價計算，曾超過三十一億元，但用戶收
費增加，可以補貼。

重新劃分縣會選區 投“是”票即贊成，投
“否”票即反對。一九八一年制定的新法採用
四十五個縣會選區的界限。財政上的影響：
例法通過，加州與地方政府並無財務。如反對
對，加州政府須耗費二十五萬元，縣區政府耗
費三十五萬元。

重新劃分（加州）參議員選區 投“是”票即贊成，
投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會制定
一法規，改劃五十個參議員的界線。財政上的
影響：例法通過，加州與地方政府的經費並無
影響。如反對對，加州政府須耗費三十七萬元，
縣區政府耗費五十萬元。

重新劃分（加州）眾議員選區 投“是”票即贊成，
投“否”票即反對。一九八一年加州議會制定
一法令，改劃八十個眾議員的界線。財政上的
影響：例法通過，加州與地方政府不用耗費。
如反對對，加州政府耗費四十萬元，縣區政府
耗費六十萬元。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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三藩市縣地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

MEDIAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES
CUIDAD Y CONDADO

A <- 263 SI 贊成
<- 264 NO 反对
¿Debería la Junta de Supervisores tener el poder de pedir dinero a través de la emisión de pagos aparte impuestos a recabar en la manera establecida por la ley estatal a través del decreto de la Junta de Supervisores?

B <- 267 SI 贊成
<- 268 NO 反对
¿Debería permitir a la Junta de Supervisores ordenar el Registro de Electores que lleva a cabo cualquier elección municipal general, decidir o aprobar por medio del correo?

C <- 271 SI 贊成
<- 272 NO 反对
¿Debería la ciudad contribuir a un plan de salud para los empleados de la ciudad que fallece una contribución promedio de los diez años del estado que tenga la población más grande?

D <- 274 SI 贊成
<- 275 NO 反对
¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los cánceres subvencionables de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados por los servicios de Salud?

E <- 278 SI 贊成
<- 279 NO 反对
¿Debería permitir al cáncer subvencionable de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al cese de nuevo después de los 65 años de edad?

F <- 281 SI 贊成
<- 282 NO 反对
¿Debería llevarse a cabo investigaciones de autopsia y de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como ha sido determinado por la Junta de Jubilaciones en el proceso del cáncer de cáncer por la misma cada dos años y que efforts getas han pagado con las contribuciones de la ciudad?

G <- 285 SI 贊成
<- 286 NO 反对
¿Debería la Junta de Supervisores tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar los dinero de pensión para inversiones sujeta a los poderes de revocación del Director?
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

H

YES 288

NO 289

Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

I

YES 292

NO 293

Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

J

YES 296

NO 297

Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

K

YES 300

NO 301

Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisioral election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisioral election assume the office of President of the Board?

L

YES 303

NO 304

Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

M

YES 307

NO 308

Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

N

YES 310

NO 311
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Sí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Déberia cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Salud Pública: ¿abrogar las últimas disposiciones sobre el Alcalde y el Superintendente de la Junta de Salud?</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Declaración de Política:** 1. Se ordenó la puesta de San Francisco a los recientes asuntos de precios de la Comisión de Pintura de la Junta de San Francisco. 2. Se recomendó al Comité de Pintura que se usen los materiales de pintura que se hayan usado en el trabajo. 3. Se decidió que el trabajo se haga en el transcurso de los próximos días. 4. Se pidió a las personas interesadas que se aprueben los materiales de pintura que se use en el trabajo.

**Declaración de Política:** 1. Se pidió a la Junta de Salud Pública que se aprobaran los materiales de pintura que se hayan usado en el trabajo. 2. Se recomendó que se usen los materiales de pintura que se hayan usado en el trabajo. 3. Se decidió que el trabajo se haga en el transcurso de los próximos días. 4. Se pidió a las personas interesadas que se aprueben los materiales de pintura que se use en el trabajo.
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a citizen of the United States.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—If I have been convicted of a crime, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must register again.

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
   • three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
   • two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
   • two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • That you need to vote early
   • your registered voting address
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed
   • then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed next to your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.

---

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polling place to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

CANDIDATE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible, and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro temore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joun Cutelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.

My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:
- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Geymant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famar and Walter Jee; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE  
Office Number 1  
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years  
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner  
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.  
As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years. I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F.; authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.  
The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.  

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE  
Office Number 1  
ALFRED G. CHIANTHELLI

My age is 42  
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney  
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.  

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City's cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller's Statement on "A"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time."

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue; and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal govern-

ment, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by (double parenthesis).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle unencumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the payment of such fund as of the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as (herein) hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinabove in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

(When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefore cannot be made available as hereinabove in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. The payment in full shall be made to the holder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid.

The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness then outstanding, such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

29
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it’s possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by tele-phone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**Employee Dental Plan**

**PROPOSITION C**

Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “C”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000.”

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “C”**

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

---

**NOTE**

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57**
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D

Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category "Surviving Spouse" and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Harry G. Britt  Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:  Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Parlichan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8
Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
**PROPOSITION E**

Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

---

**Controller's Statement on “E”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

**How Supervisors Voted on “E”**

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

---

**NOTE**

Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie E. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Neblor
Supervisor Lee S. Dobson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykve N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it's possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city's general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city's general fund.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition “F” will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition “F” will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition “F” is a “no-cost,” Charter Amendment.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “F”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

CAPÍTULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD
DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 8 de junio. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral. Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第章工作良機

你可以在 六月八日 三藩市選舉日工作。特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘。在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票。請往市政廳（灣街及半街）一五五室申請。
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment. VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.3.14 Investment of Pension Monies
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.3.03, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition "H":

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
               Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
               Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
               Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day,
Tuesday, June 8th.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
INO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente.
Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?

That’s right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let’s not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “I”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Retirement Administrators Exemption

PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board's financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board's chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissive for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City
and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such funds or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or (actuary) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors’ Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition “K” would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote “YES” on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.
Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

(end)
Board of Supervisors Presidency

PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

“Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.”

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmer,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahbrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Bayliss
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Kegion
Marion Keil
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennealy
Elise Kuersten
Ginger Love
David Lyons
John Mack
Nora Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moreko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concklin
Margarette Connely
Ervin Delman
Ora Denett
Melba Denis
Anne Deutchman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatao
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladnin
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grei
Victoria Grei
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Haynes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Eiel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarrey
Nancy McGarrey
Thomas McGarrey
Mildred Morten
Chris Murph
Walter O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Lousie Park
Stefani Phipps
Al Roesch
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salano
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seese
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Swohoda
Richard Szeto
James Timoss
Fritz Toh
John Van Heusden
Alexandra Vukich
Dorothy Vukich
Raymond Vukich
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

• Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
• Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
• Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
• Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
• Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagalata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Maritomer McNerney, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Meylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orsi
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940’s that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

PROPOSITION L

2.202 President and Committees of the Board

(The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1982, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.) At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
Fingerprint Computer

PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by: Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
P.G. & E. Rates

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:

1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot

Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don’t want to pay for PG&E’s bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let’s be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG and E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Sivaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union, #860

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E’s purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((Double parentheses)).

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.
In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fee schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until approved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution."

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents, retired persons’ dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors, (and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
(Proposition D, Continued)

County Employees’ Retirement System ((3)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of “the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to “the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons’ dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund of the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition herefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

BIG BROTHERS:
IT’S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR TWO

- If you are patient and understanding,
- If your life is stable,
- If you can be a friend to a child, and
- If you have a few hours a week to share (for at least a year);
  Then you may be the perfect Big Brother.

Big Brothers is a non-profit youth service agency which matches male volunteers to boys between the ages of 7 and 17, from father-absent homes.

Being a Big Brother offers a man the unique opportunity to contribute to his community and himself, while providing friendship and guidance to a young boy.

If you are over 18, and interested, call

BIG BROTHERS of San Francisco • 434-4860
NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits
Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviv-

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations
The mortality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during said year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.680 Board Composition
The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two-year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall
sident official of an insurance company, ((and)) one of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine; ((and)) three members elected by the active members of the system from among their number, and, one member elected by the retired members of the system from among their number. The city attorney may designate, by written document filed with the board, an assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein, the terms of office of the members, other than the two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years thereafter). Each member of the health service board shall give bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unexpired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be filled by a special election to be completed within 60 days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election is to be held and completed within six months after such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership on the health service board shall be nominated by a written nomination of 20 members filed with the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy occurs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and shall furnish the same to all members of the system between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and canvass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar of voters shall have the power to make such regulations respecting the form, distribution and canvassing of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal in number to the number to be elected who receive the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected. Not more than one employee of any one department or office may be a member of the health service board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the retired member position herein created shall be filled concurrently with the next regular election for an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.670 Board Composition
The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the board of administration, the board of trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((4)), appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, ((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.)) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either) each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among ((three)) four persons whose names shall have been submitted to ((him)) the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((president)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((J)); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1986. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office of unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty (60) days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.553 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretory general manager.)) Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
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DEMOCRATS:
Support your party
NOW!

Democracy does not work without
thousands of contributors and participants.

Clip out and mail this coupon today:

Enclosed is my contribution of □ $5 □ $10 □ $15 □ $25 □ More_____.
□ I will volunteer in the office.
□ I will volunteer to register voters.
□ I will volunteer as a door-to-door canvasser for the Democratic Party.

NAME
ADDRESS

PHONE ZIP

Mail this coupon to: S.F. Democratic Party
760 Market Street, Room 529
San Francisco, CA 94102

Thank you,
Agar Jaicks,
Chair, S.F. Democratic Central Committee
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT

APLICACIÓN PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
   LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
   Application MUST ALSO BE MOVED BELOW BY APPLICANT. Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE
   JUNE 8, 1982
   I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
   ENVIEME LA BALOTA A:
   請將選票寄給本人下址:

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
   FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
   申請人簽名

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
   Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
   申請人在舊金山登記選舉住址

6. ☐ I prefer election materials in English
    ☐ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
    如果你已遷居
    如果你已居住，現所居住地址不是你在
    註銷選舉冊冊上之住址，請填寫此表格。
    我已在九____年____月____日遷居
    我現在的住址是：

7. IF YOU HAVE MOVED
   Complete this section if you have moved and
   now reside at an address other than that
   shown on your affidavit of registration.
   I moved on _______________ 19____.
   My residence address is
   ________________________________.
   Zip Code ______________________

   NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to
   this election may obtain an absente ballot. A voter moving
   more than 29 days prior to the election
   and who did not re-register prior to
   the registration closing date for this
   election is not eligible to vote.

MAIL TO:
    ABSENT VOTING SECTION
    REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
    ROOM 156, CITY HALL
    SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
DE LA TARDE, MARTES, 1° JUNIO
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCIÓN.

ÚLTIMA FECHA PARA RECIBIR LA SOLICITUD ES 5:00 DE LA TARDE, MARTES 1° JUNIO
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCIÓN.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
SOLAMENTE PARA USO DEL REGISTRADOR

Prec. No. ____________________________
Pol. Affl. ____________________________
Ballot No. ____________________________
Ballot Mailed _________________________
Ballot Returned _______________________
Aff. Record _________________________
Inspector's Notice ____________________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

Date ____________________ Deputy Registrar ____________________
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

A 第一步
如何用自動投票機
如有錯誤，請向助理員換取新選票。

STEP 1

Note: Si hace algun error, devuélva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

USING BOTH HANDS
INSERT THE BALLOT CARD ALL THE WAY INTO THE VOTOMATIC.
Usando las dos manos, meta la tarjeta de votar completamente dentro del "Votomatic."

B 第一步
請雙手持票向自動機將選票插入。

STEP 2

BE SURE THE TWO SLOTS IN THE STUB OF YOUR CARD FIT DOWN OVER THE TWO RED PINS.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

C 第二步
請確認選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

HOLD PUNCH VERTICAL (STRAIGHT UP). PUNCH STRAIGHT DOWN THROUGH THE BALLOT CARD TO INDICATE YOUR CHOICE. DO NOT USE PEN OR PENCIL.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把選票之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

AFTER VOTING, WITHDRAW THE BALLOT CARD AND PLACE IT INSIDE THE ENVELOPE POCKET, WITH THE STUB SHOWING.

STEP 4

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

B 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格須備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor/Gobernador/州長</th>
<th>Vote for One/Vote por Uno</th>
<th>請選一名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher/Scientífico Político-Maestro 政治學者－教師</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor/Cirujano de los Arboles-Quiropractico 樹木保養員－按摩脊柱治療員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor/Coordinadora de Familia, Asesora (Consejera) 家庭協調員，諮詢員</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles/Alcaldé, Los Angeles 洛杉穂市市長</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Comerciante 商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian/Portero 看守人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN &quot;GOLF&quot; TREVINO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager/Gerente de Flota de Automóviles 汽車隊管理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer-Cattlemann/Granjero-Ganadero 農夫－牧夫</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator/Abogado/Farmacéutico/Administrador 律師／藥劑師／管理人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive/Escritora, Consultora, Ejecutiva 作家，顧問，總經理</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman/Actor, Maestro, Comerciante 演員，教師，商人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Majority Leader/Líder de la Mayoría en el Senado 參議院多數黨領袖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Packer/Enlatador, Empacador Jubilado 退休包裝工人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL WATKINS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES “CHUCK” PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH R. SMITH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN HOWARD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE KEYSER</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lieutenant Governor**

**Secretary of State**
### Controller

**IRA CLARK**  
Businessman-Educator  
Comerciante-Educador  
商人－教育家

**KENNETH CORY**  
California State Controller  
Contralor del Estado de California  
加州審計官

### Treasurer

**JESSE M. UNRUH**  
State Treasurer  
Tesorero Estatal  
加州司庫

### Attorney General

**OMER L. RAINS**  
Senator/Prosecuting Attorney  
Senador/Abogado Fiscal  
參議員／檢察官

**JOHN VAN DE KAMP**  
District Attorney, Los Angeles County  
Procurador del Distrito del Condado de Los Angeles  
洛杉磯縣地方檢察官
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY COLLIS</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN GOLDSTEIN</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM BROWN JR.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUENTIN KOPP</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEONEL MONTEREY</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE SCOTT</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. JOHN SHIMMON</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN CHURCH</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore Vidal</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hampton</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. Brown Jr.</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter F. Buchanan</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Metzger</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Morgan</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul B. Carpenter</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Caplette</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Dubinsky-Chote</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel K. Whitehurst</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. Wertz Jr.</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Representative in Congress — 6th District

**Diputado al Congreso — Distrito #6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANTHONY J. INTINTOLI JR.</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOUIS P. MOUNTANOS</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOEL A. DAY</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOUISE H. RENNE</strong></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BARBARA BOXER</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United States Representative**

Election Primaria
8 de Junio de 1992

---

### Member of the Assembly — 17th Assembly District

**Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIE L. BROWN JR.</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker, California Assembly**

Election Primaria
6 de Junio de 1982

---

6/17-3-6D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GWENN CRAIG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN F. CROWLEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULU M. CARTER</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUREEN CHEW</td>
<td>Educador/Educadora</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE BELISLE DALEY</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY GRIFFIN</td>
<td>Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWRENCE A. WILSON</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY VAIL</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLORIA SAMANTHA YRUEGAS</td>
<td>Commissioner, Recreation-Parks/Comisionada, Recreation-Parques</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRU HUGUNIN</td>
<td>Consultant/Consejero</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON HUBERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDY L. HUFFMAN</td>
<td>Political Organizer/Organizadora Política</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE BRADY</td>
<td>D.A. Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERNARD F. BRADY</td>
<td>Estate Administrator/Administrador Estatal</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN J. BIERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY KILROY</td>
<td>Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAR JAICKS</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHANIE MISCHAK</td>
<td>Personnel Analyst/Analizadora de Personal</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE A. MINNICK</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Specialist/Especialista en Justicia Criminal</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# NONPARTISAN BALLOT

## JUDICIAL

### Judge of the Superior Court, Office #9
- **Name:** DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN
- **Role:** Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior
- **Vote:** 185

### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office #1
- **Name:** ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI
  - **Role:** Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal
- **Name:** PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY
  - **Role:** Attorney/Abogada
- **Name:** RICHARD E. BEST
  - **Role:** Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Corte
- **Name:** RICHARD TULLIS
  - **Role:** Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente
- **Vote:** 188, 189, 190, 191

## SCHOOL

### Superintendent of Public Instruction
- **Name:** GEORGIA MARSHALL
  - **Role:** Principal/Directora
- **Name:** RICHARD E. FERRARO
  - **Role:** Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Membro, consejo de Educación de Los Angeles
- **Name:** WILSON RILES
  - **Role:** State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública
- **Name:** JANET L. ALLEN
  - **Role:** Educator-Businesswoman/Educadora-Mujer Empresaria
- **Name:** DANIEL NUSBAUM
  - **Role:** Educator/Musician/Educadora-Músico
- **Name:** BILL HONIG
  - **Role:** District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar
- **Name:** MYRON LIEBERMAN
  - **Role:** School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar
- **Name:** GENE PRAT
  - **Role:** Presidential Education Advisor/Asesor del Presidente para Asuntos Educativos
- **Name:** JEANNE BAIRD
  - **Role:** Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos
- **Vote:** 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202

## CITY & COUNTY

### Assessor
- **Name:** SAM DUCA
  - **Role:** Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargho
- **Vote:** 205

### Public Defender
- **Name:** JEFF BROWN
  - **Role:** Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargho
- **Vote:** 208

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT. Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE. Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Amends “change in ownership” definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAIL. Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers). Repeals existing taxes. Reenacts state “pickup” estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
PROPÓSITOS ESTATUALES

212 A FAVOR 1 ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981. Opciones emitidas de bonos por $495,000,000 para ser usadas en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

213 EN CONTRA 2 PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO. Revoca la disposición (Constitución) de que el Vicegobernador sea Presidente del Senado; Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo estatal o local.


216 NO 4 FIANZA. Prohibe el fijación de fianzas bajo fianza cuando la parte tiene realizadas de investigación conciliaciones de un gobierno de que la parte que pone en libertad puede causar grave daño físico a otros. Impacto fiscal: Aumenta el costo a los gobiernos locales de encarcelamiento y pendenciones judiciales para fianza. Podrían haber beneficios compensativos si la persona fuera más tarde sentenciada a la cárcel a la fianza.


INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $630,000.

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
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三藩市縣地方普選
初選 一九八二年六月八日

所得稅數調零 减除法案 規定續續使用物
價指數百分率為調整個人所得稅漸進稅槭的基
礎。財政上所受影響；州政府稅收在一九八二
年約少四億四千五百萬元，以後年年減少或增
加政府財政收入及减少。其補助地方政府與學
校的經費亦相應減少。

JUSTICIA PENAL. Sustituyendo la Constitución y garantizando el derecho
a la defensa de los ciudadanos con el procedimiento electoral y de ultrapasar los límites de poderes de gobierno.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUIDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un
voto "Sí" aprueba, un voto "No" rechaza, una ley que dispone la construcción de artefactos hidráulicos en el proyecto del Canal Periférico. Impacto fiscal: Sí se aprueba, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $250,000; si se rechaza, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $350,000.

REPARTICION, DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES, Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un
voto "No" rechaza, un ley que establece los límites de los 46 distritos legislativos. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $250,000; si se rechaza, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $350,000.

REPARTICION, DISTRITOS SENATORIALES, Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un
voto "No" rechaza, un ley que establece los límites de los 40 distritos legislativos. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $370,000; si se rechaza, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $380,000.

REPARTICION, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA, Un voto "Sí" aprueba, un
voto "No" rechaza, un ley que establece los límites de los 60 distritos de la Asamblea. Impacto fiscal: Si se aprueba, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $400,000; si se rechaza, el costo del proyecto se aproxima a $500,000.

刑事審判 修正憲法及規定事務，處理選民程序
及刑罰，以及處理權利及義務保護，及相關受害者
事件。財政上的影響：州政府所受損失重大，難於確定其程度。

水利設備包括外圍運河 投“是”票即贊成，投
“否”票即反對。一項法案指定中央流域計
劃增加水利設備。財政上的影響：如目前政策
施行，州政府必須補貼，亦無須剝削州府政府其
他計劃的稅款。已經預計總經費為九八
年州府預算，會超過三十一億元，但用戶收
費增加，可以彌補。

重新劃分國會選區 投“是”票即贊成，投
“否”票即反對。一九八一年州府制定的法規採用
四十五個國會選區的範圍。財政上的影響：
如獲通過，州政府政府將不需付費。如遭反
對，州政府政府將需補貼三十億元，縣政府政府
補貼五十億元。

重新劃分（加州）參議區 投“是”票即贊成，投
“否”票即反對。一九八一年州府參議會制
定一個法案，改訂四十個參議區的範圍。財政上的
影響：如獲通過，州政府政府將不受影響。如遭反
對，州政府政府將需補貼三十億，縣政府政府
補貼五十億元。

重新劃分（加州）衆議區 投“是”票即贊成，投
“否”票即反對。一九八一年州府衆議會制
定一個法案，改訂八十個衆議區的範圍。財政上的
影響：如獲通過，州政府政府將不受影響。如遭反
對，州政府政府將需補貼四十億元，縣政府政府
補貼五十億元。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES
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263 SI 赞成
264 NO 反对

267 SI 赞成
268 NO 反对

271 SI 赞成
272 NO 反对

274 SI 赞成
275 NO 反对

278 SI 赞成
279 NO 反对

281 SI 赞成
282 NO 反对

285 SI 赞成
286 NO 反对

市参議会是否批准借款，依照州法律或市
参議会法令发行預期獲息債券?

市政府應否為市職工添設牙醫保健費，保
健費額為加州人口最衆的十個縣區的平均保健
費?

市政府應否在同一年額上津贴在職員工和
已退休員工的未亡配偶，一如市政府現在在保
健服務制度內的在職員工和已退休員工?

退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶，目前可享
受到輪替，如果他們在六十歲後再婚，應否
繼續享受這種輪替?

退休制度的輪替計劃和人數標準，應否每
兩年考察一次，由退休局規定退休金額和某些
費用，由市政府支付?

退休局是否具有唯一的權力，以管理退休
基金用於投資，但須受市經計官審核的約束?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCIÓN PRIMARIA - 8 DE JUNIO DE 1982

288 SI 贊成
H ¿Debería cambiar la estructura de la Junta del Servicio de Salud Pública, si se designa dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y uno empleado público, o ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores?

289 NO 反对

292 SI 贊成
I ¿Debería cambiar la estructura de la Junta de Jubilaciones designando dos miembros, uno a ser designado por el Alcalde y un empleado público, o ser elegido por los miembros jubilados y el miembro de los supervisores a ser designado por la Junta de Supervisores y la designación del Secretario General Administrador deberían ser eliminados?

293 NO 反对

296 SI 贊成
J ¿Debería ser designado el Secretario General Administrador del Sistema de Jubilaciones por la Junta de Jubilaciones y estar encargado del Servicio Civil y permitirse a dicho Administrador designar a un subsecretario ejecutivo para desempeñar tal cargo en el cargo del administrador?

297 NO 反对

300 SI 贊成
K ¿Debería cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores designar un asistente legislativo quien llevará a cabo sus funciones en el cargo del miembro?

301 NO 反对

303 SI 贊成
L ¿Debería el supervisor que recibió la mayoría de votos en la elección de supervisores en noviembre de 1980 tomar el cargo de Presidente de la Junta y a partir del 9 de enero de 1983 y cada segundo año a partir de esa fecha el candidato que recibe la mayoría de votos durante la última elección de supervisores electores deberá asumir el cargo de Presidente de la Junta?

304 NO 反对

307 SI 贊成
M ¿Declaración de Política: ¿Debería la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco, durante el año fiscal de 1982-1983, seguir la competencia para bienes digitales para el uso del personal encargado de hacer cumplir la Ley de San Francisco?

308 NO 反对

310 SI 贊成
N ¿Declaración de Política: ¿Se aprobó la ley de San Francisco a los recuerdos al programa de la Compañía de Gas y Electricidad del Pacífico recomendó efímicamente que la Comisión Estatal de Servicios Públicos reduzca las pruebas a cero estaba el 1 de diciembre de 1981 y además poder otros remedios?

311 NO 反对
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
   • are at least 18 years of age on election day.
   • are a citizen of the United States.
   • are a resident of California, and
   • are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—If I have been convicted of a crime, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes. The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election.
   Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must register again.

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
   • State Assemblyman
   • United States Congressman
   • United States Senator
   • State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
   • Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
   • and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
   • three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
   • two State Senate Districts (SD 5, 6)
   • two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8, 3)
   (See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year or
   • mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • That you need to vote early
   • your registered voting address
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed
   • then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed next to your name and address sent with this Voters’ Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don't know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can't help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I've written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER (Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party’s candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party’s candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY’S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polling place to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City’s fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
CANDIDATE FOR
ASSESSOR

SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:

Cyril I. Magnin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2714-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, MD, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCauley Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Varusin, 91 Cameo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4042-20th St., Youth Director
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hills Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jung, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Louise, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reino, 1150 Union St., Public Relations
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Walter H. Shorestein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Budden, 140 Chenery, Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arbello, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Cobleitz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Farnan, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucio Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Moskowitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellet Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

CANDIDATE FOR
PUBLIC DEFENDER

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4042 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bagoi, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wai Yong Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlota Tastido Del Pontillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioner
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hills Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Woyne Friday, 1095 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 830 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 80 Harper St., Exec. Secty, Rent Control Board
Muttie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andreas J. Jepson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magnin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward J. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Margolin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Neele, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Ori, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadie Reid, 476 Jost Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 51 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57.
My occupation is Lawyer.
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Carilli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kerne, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrle Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tazey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.

Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:

- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.

As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.

Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Geyman; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamaras; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famarin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalia Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Gianinni, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeanne Schmidt, Jack Tufts. Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

A Yes on Proposition “A” would allow us to join many cities such as San Jose, San Diego, Berkeley, Richmond, Sacramento, Oakland and many counties such as Los Angeles, Solano, Santa Clara, Fresno, Contra Costa and Orange in using short-term financing to balance their interest costs and revenues.

Yes on Proposition “A” is recommended by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors and I join them in asking you to vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal govern-

ment, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.305 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment of any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle uncumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as ((herein)) hereinafore authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year

in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipt of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimate of all taxes levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of the principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such amount of all taxes actually issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
Mail Ballot Elections

PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote “No” on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board “may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election.”

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line-up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote “No” on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don’t be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters’ rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let’s not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O’Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based “Committee for Economic Democracy” will likely suggest that we vote by tele-phone “call in” next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish in-
terest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner
PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

Fifty-two out of fifty-eight counties in California provide dental care for their employees. So does the State of California and all other major California cities. Eight thousand San Francisco public employees are already provided with a dental plan. Proposition "C" would extend this benefit to employees currently denied dental care.

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits. Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller’s Statement on “D”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS ON PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category “Surviving Spouse” and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker’s retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition “D” subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “D”.

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucichello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by: 
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Patrichan, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James R. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, Board of Supervisors

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Suriving Spouse Retirement Benefits

PROPOSITION E

Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarryes after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

"Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial."

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP E APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition “E” in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law.

More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retiree to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “E”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaykee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city's general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city’s general fund.

Controller’s Statement on “F”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “F”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinaro
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolton
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and
County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Retirement Board Investment Powers

PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller’s Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is “deposited” with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition “G” is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System’s investment portfolio.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “G” will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller’s Office, the Treasurer’s Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition “G” retains the Controller’s unquestioned authority to audit all of the System’s accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition “G” is a “no-cost” Charter Amendment. VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “G”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
Health Service Board Composition

PROPOSITION H
Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

Controller's Statement on "H"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition "H":

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equitable that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "H".

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOOKING FOR WORK?  LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?

That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administrate for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION "I"

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT

James T. Ferguson

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $41, o como inspector, ganando $50.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition “J” will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive officer to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition “J” is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board, the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.
3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition “J” is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition “J” is a “no-cost” proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “J”.

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "K"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.

Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe. (end)
Board of Supervisors Presidency

PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller's Statement on "L"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That's why we must write it into the law

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Bob Guichard
George Rehmet, Concerned Voters of San Francisco
Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahlstrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Arenson
Robert Arenson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Baylauc
Robert Batchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borgelt
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Kregnan
Marion Kell
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennelal
Elise Kuenister
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Neva Madison
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moretsko

Joyce Brown
Marion Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concell
Margaret Conolly
Ervin Delman
Ora Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Deuschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fattoh
Martin Fellhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladlen
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hau

Ethel Martin
Joe McDonald
Anne McGarvey
Nancy McGarvey
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortensen
Chris Murphy
Walter O'Donnell
W. F. O'Keefe, Sr.
Lester O'Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefan Phipps
Al Ronsch
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salaro
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Sceee
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Svozoda
Richard Szeto
James Timoosi
Fritz Toalih
John Van Heusden
Alexandra Vukitsch
Dorothy Vukitsch
Raymond Vukitsch
Richard Wall

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

• Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
• Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);

• Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
• Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
• Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter's designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON'T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Borice
George Evankovich, Union official
Marsha Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Mortimer McInerney, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moylan, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orsi
Lester O'Shea
Stan Smith, Union official
Joseph Tainey, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Board of Supervisors Presidency

ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940’s that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION “L”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses)).

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1932, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.) At 12:00 o’clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
Fingerprint Computer

PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City’s law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can't do it because they don't have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn't work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won't even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don't just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don't have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensible crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let's give the police the ultramodern "tools" they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
P.G. & E. Rates

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on "N"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot
Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. N APPEARS ON PAGE 56
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don’t want to pay for PG&E’s bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let’s be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PG&E has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 4.310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PG&E a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PG&E has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PG&E to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:
Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Sunaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of the receipts from the taxes of said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

((The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes

or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include therein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.))

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face**; deletions are indicated by (double parenthesis).

9.103 Municipal Elections

On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted upon by such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted upon at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face type**; deletions are indicated by ((Double parentheses)).

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.

In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fees schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until approved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, ((exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be “the average contribution.”

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such funds or gifts as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons, the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-fifth of “the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board, in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to “the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board, in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contribution required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing Medicare health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafter set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents, retired persons’ dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees of the school district and the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
County Employees' Retirement System (h), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviving spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations

The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(h), (5), said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEST OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.680 Board Composition

The health service board shall consist of ((seven)) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee, a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-60

expiring on May 15 of each year)). The term of ((one)) two of the elective members shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 ((each of the following years)) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The terms of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in ((each of the following years)) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall...
sident official of an insurance company, ((und,)) one
of whom shall be experienced in medical insurance or
actuarial science and the other a doctor of medicine;
((and,)) three members elected by the active members
of the system from among their number, and, one
member elected by the retired members of the system
from among their number. The city attorney may de-
signate, by written document filed with the board, an
assistant city attorney to attend board meetings and to
act for him in his place. Except as set forth herein,
the terms of office of the members, other than the
two ex-officio members, shall be five years ((one term
expire on May 15, 1987 and every five years there-
after).

Each member of the health service board shall give
bond in the sum of $10,000, the premium on which
shall be paid out of the funds of the system. A
vacancy in the offices appointive by the mayor shall
be filled by appointment by the mayor for the unex-
pired term. A vacancy in an elective office shall be
filled by a special election to be completed within 60
days after the vacancy occurs unless a regular election
is to be held and completed within six months after
such occurrence. Candidates for elective membership
on the health service board shall be nominated by
a written nomination of 20 members filed with
the registrar of voters not earlier than April 1st nor later
than April 15th of each year in which a vacancy oc-
curs. The registrar of voters shall prepare ballots and
shall furnish the same to all members of the system
between April 15th and April 25th and shall receive
the ballots between April 25th and May 7th and can-
vass and certify the results on May 8th. The registrar
of voters shall have the power to make such regula-
tions respecting the form, distribution and canvassing
of the ballots as may be necessary to secure secrecy
of the ballots and prevent fraud. The persons equal
in number to the number to be elected who receive
the greatest number of votes shall be declared elected.
Not more than one employee of any one department
or office may be a member of the health service
board. Notwithstanding the provisions of this amend-
mend, the retired member position herein created shall
be filled concurrently with the next regular election for
an active member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by
bold-face type; deletions are indicated by
(double parentheses).

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a re-
tirement board, which is hereby created, and which
shall be the successor and have the powers and the
duties of the board of administration, the board of
trustees of the police relief and pension fund, and the
board of fire pension fund commissioners. The retire-
ment board shall consist of ((the president)) a
member of the board of supervisors ((,)) appointed by
the board of supervisors for two years terms, ((three
members)) four members to be appointed by the
mayor, ((and)) three members elected from the active
members from among their number and one member
elected by the retired members of the retirement sys-
tem from among their number. ((who shall not include
retired persons of the retirement system.)) The
members appointed by the mayor shall ((either)) each
hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be ex-
perienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee
pension planning, or investment portfolio management,
and shall be appointed by the mayor from among
((three)) four persons whose names shall have been
submitted to ((him)) the mayor for such appoint-
ment by a committee consisting of two members each
of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association
of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board
and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Com-
merce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at
any one time, more than one appointed member who
holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the
same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office
of the ((six)) eight members, other than the ((pre-
sident)) member of the board of supervisors, shall be
five years, and the terms presently in effect for ap-
pointed and elected members shall continue to apply
((,)); provided, however, that the term of office of
the elected members shall expire in February in each of
the following years and every five years thereafter:
1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the
members appointed by the mayor shall expire in Fe-
bruary in each of the following years and every five
a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy
shall occur during a term of office of any member ap-
pointed by the mayor, the term of office or unex-
pired portion of the vacated term of office shall be
filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty
(60) days following the expiration of a term of office
or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office.
However, should the affirmation committee not submit
votes to the mayor the required name or names within 30
days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy
with an individual who meets the qualifications
specified above without committee recommendation.
Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of
an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in
accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the
administrative code of the city and county of San
Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving
the term of an elected retired member, the election of
a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar
of voters on a statement for the provisions set forth by
ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected
retired member shall take office in February 1983 and
every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the
implementation of this section shall be paid from the
accumulated contributions of the city and county. The
members of the retirement board shall serve without
compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions
of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a
secretary general manager)). Notwithstanding the provi-
sions of this amendment, the board positions created
herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983.
(end)
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HOW TO VOTE ON THE VOTOMATIC VOTE RECORDER

SPECIAL NOTE:
IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE, RETURN YOUR CARD AND GET ANOTHER.

STEP 1

Using both hands, insert the ballot card all the way into the Votomatic.

Nota: Si hace algún error, devuelva su tarjeta de votar y obtenga otra.

B 第一步
请双手持票向自動機將整張選票插入。

STEP 2

Be sure the two slots in the stub of your card fit down over the two red pins.

Paso 2. Asegúrese de que los dos orificios que hay al final de la tarjeta coinciden con las dos cabecitas rojas.

D 第二步
请记得将選票插入時，票尾之二孔，接合於二紅點之上。

STEP 3

Hold punch-vertical (straight up). Punch straight down through the ballot card to indicate your choice. Do not use pen or pencil.

Para votar, sostenga el instrumento de votar y perfore con él la tarjeta de votar en el lugar de los candidatos de su preferencia. No use pluma ni lápiz.

D 第三步
請把票針之選舉針，由小孔內垂直插入打孔投票。

STEP 4

After voting, withdraw the ballot card and place it inside the envelope pocket, with the stub showing.

Después de votar, saque la tarjeta del "Votomatic" y póngala bajo el cierre del sobre.

D 第四步
投票選舉之後，把選票取出，放入空封袋內，票尾凸出在外。
在封袋上，有空白格預備為投票人應用。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN HANCOCK ABBOTT</td>
<td>Political Scientist-Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND V. LIEBENBERG</td>
<td>Tree Surgeon-Chiropractor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDA IRENE PARNELL</td>
<td>Family Coordinator, Counselor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY</td>
<td>Mayor, Los Angeles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGH G. BAGLEY</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULES KIMMETT</td>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN “GOLF” TREVINO</td>
<td>Automobile Fleet Manager, Gerente de Flota de Automóviles</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK L. THOMAS</td>
<td>Farmer-Cattleman</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIO OBLEDO</td>
<td>Attorney/Pharmacist/Administrator</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENEVIEVE GRAFE MARCUS</td>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN LEE SEAMAN</td>
<td>Actor, Teacher, Businessman</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN GARAMENDI</td>
<td>Senate Majority Leader</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH S. RAMOS</td>
<td>Retired Packer, Enlistador, Embajador Jubilado</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Governor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote for One</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT LEE (BOB) SMITH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer, Consultant, Executive</td>
<td>Escritor, Consultor, Ejecutivo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL WATKINS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman/Minister</td>
<td>Comerciante/Pastor Protestante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES &quot;CHUCK&quot; PINEDA JR.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President, Correctional Association</td>
<td>Presidente, Asociación Correccional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. McCARTHY</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature</td>
<td>Asambleísta, de la Legislatura de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Secretary of State</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote for One</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH R. SMITH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar/Plumbing Contractor</td>
<td>Solar/Fontanero (Plomero) Contratista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN HOWARD</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Comisionadora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALICE KEYSER</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesswoman</td>
<td>Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California</td>
<td>Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>IRA CLARK</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>OMER L. RAINS</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member State Board of Equalization – 1st District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualamiento – Distrito #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conway Collins</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Goldstein</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brown Jr.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quentin Kopp</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonel Monterey</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Scott</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. John Shimmon</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Church</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gore Vidal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund G. Brown, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter F. Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Metzger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul B. Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ray Caplette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May Dubinsky-Chote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel K. Whitehurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William F. Wertz, Jr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Representative in Congress — 6th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY J. INTINTOLI JR.</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Attorney/Educator Abogado/Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS P. MOUNTANOS</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Retired Sheriff Alguacil Jubilado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOEL A. DAY</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Public Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISE H. RENNE</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>San Francisco Supervisor, Attorney Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BOXER</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>County Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## State Senator — 8th Senatorial District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN FORAN</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>State Senator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member of the Assembly — 17th Assembly District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBER, COUNTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE
17TH DISTRICT
MIEMBRO, COMITÉ CENTRAL DEL CONDADO - DISTRITO #17
民主黨縣區中央委員會委員，第十七議區

Vote for no more than 10
Vote por no más de 10
最多限選十名

GWENN CRAIG
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
164

JOHN F. CROWLEY
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
165

LULU M. CARTER
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
166

LAUREEN CHEW
Educator/Educatora 教育家
167

ANNE BELISLE DALEY
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
168

LARRY GRIFFIN
Appointed Incumbent/Designado en Posesión del Cargo 指派現任
169

LAWRENCE A. WILSON
Attorney/Abogado 律師
170

MARY VAIL
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
171

GLORIA SAMANTHA YRUEGAS
Commissioner, Recreation-Parks/Comisionada, Recreación-Parques 康樂與公園委員會委員
172

TERRI HUGO
Consultant/Consultor 顧問
173

RON HUBERMAN
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
174

JUDY L. HUFFMAN
Political Organizer/Organizadora Política 政治組織者
175

CATHERINE BRADY
D.A. Investigator/Investigadora del Fiscal 地方檢察官辦公室調查員
176

BERNARD F. BRADY
Estate Administrator/Administrador Estatal 實業管理人
177

SUSAN J. BIERMAN
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
178

TONY KILROY
Civil Engineer/Ingeniero Civil 土木工程師
179

AGAR JAIKES
Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo 現任
180

STEPHANIE MISCRAK
Personnel Analyst/Analizadora de Personal 人事分析員
181

LOUISE A. MINNICK
Criminal Justice Specialist/Especialista en Justicia Criminal 刑事審判專家
182
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICER</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Candidate/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE of the Superior Court, Office #9</td>
<td>Juez de la Corte Superior, Oficina #9</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>DANIEL H. WEINSTEIN</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court/Juez de la Corte Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE of the Municipal Court, Office #1</td>
<td>Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>RICHARD E. BEST</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Assistant Court Commissioner/Asistente del Comisario de Cortes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>RICHARD TULLIS</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Deputy Attorney General/Abogado General Suplente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERINTENDENT of Public Instruction</td>
<td>Superintendente de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>GEORGIA MARSHALL</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Principal/Directora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>RICHARD E. FERRARO</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Member, Los Angeles Board of Education/Miembro, consejo de Educación de Los Ángeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>JANET L. ALLEN</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Educator-Businesswoman/Educadora Empresaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>DANIEL NUSBAUM</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Educator, Musician/Educadora-Músico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>BILL HÖNIG</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>MYRON LIEBERMAN</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>School Board Negotiator/Negociador de Consejo Escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>GENE PRAT</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>JEANNE BAIRD</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Educational Project Advisor/Asesora para Proyectos Educativos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSOR</td>
<td>Asesor</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>SAM DUCA</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnty &amp; County</td>
<td>Ciudad y Condado</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>JEFF BROWN</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Incumbent/En Posesión del Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
PRIMARY ELECTION - JUNE 8, 1982  

MEASURES SUBMITTED TO VOTE OF VOTERS

STATE PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW PRISON CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT.</td>
<td>Provides $495,000,000 bond issue to be used for the construction of the state prisons.</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT OF SENATE.</td>
<td>Repeals Constitutional provision that Lieutenant Governor is President of Senate. Fiscal impact: No direct state or local impact.</td>
<td>YES 215</td>
<td>NO 216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION.</td>
<td>Amends &quot;change in ownership&quot; definition to exclude replacement of property taken by eminent domain type proceedings. Fiscal impact: Significant loss of property tax revenues and increase in administrative costs to local governments. Increased state costs to provide offsetting aid to local school and community college districts. Increase in state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES 219</td>
<td>NO 220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAIL.</td>
<td>Prohibits release on bail where court makes findings regarding likelihood of released person causing great bodily harm to others. Fiscal impact: Increase jail and bail hearing costs of local governments. Could be offsetting savings if person later sentenced to jail or prison.</td>
<td>YES 223</td>
<td>NO 224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Miller).</td>
<td>Repeals existing taxes. Renacts state &quot;pickup&quot; estate tax equal to specified federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 228</td>
<td>NO 229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>AGAINST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIFT AND INHERITANCE TAXES (Proponent Rogers).</td>
<td>Repeals existing taxes. Renacts state &quot;pickup&quot; estate tax equal to federal tax credit. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $130 million in 1982-83, $365 million in 1983-84, and higher amounts thereafter. Save state about $6 million annually in administrative costs. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.</td>
<td>YES 232</td>
<td>NO 233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Votos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>212 A Favor</td>
<td>赞成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 En Contra</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Sí</td>
<td>赞成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 No</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Sí</td>
<td>赞成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 No</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 Sí</td>
<td>赞成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 No</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 Sí</td>
<td>赞成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 No</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 Sí</td>
<td>赞成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 No</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Propuestas Estatales**

1. **ACTA DE BONOS PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE NUEVAS PRISIONES DE 1981.** Estimado costo de bonos por $495,000,000, para ser usados en la construcción de prisiones estatales.

2. **PRESIDENTE DEL SENADO.** Nueva proposición constitucional que el Gobernador sea el Presidente del Senado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto directo o local.

3. **FIJACIÓN DE IMPUESTOS, VALUACIÓN DE PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE.** Continúa la difusión del "fuero de dueño" para evitar recelos de propiedad. Impacto fiscal: Suficiente pérdida de réditos del impuesto a la propiedad y aumento en el costo de las tarjetas administrativas para gobiernos locales. Impacto local: Aumenta el costo a los gobiernos locales de escuelas y dependencias para finanzas. Podrían haber ahorros compensatorios si la persona fuera más tarde cuestionada a la cuestión a la próxima.

4. **FIANZA.** Prohibir dar libertad bajo fianza cuando la caso tiene resultados de investigación concentrados en la probabilidad de que la persona puesta en libertad pueda causar gravi daños físicos a otros. Impacto fiscal: Aumenta el costo a los gobiernos locales de escuelas y dependencias para finanzas. Podrían haber ahorros compensatorios si la persona fuera más tarde cuestionada a la cuestión a la próxima.


---

**三藩市縣地方普選**

初選 一九八二年六月八日

州提案

新詐欺建築公估法案。

發行公估 $495,000,000, 作爲建築加蓋專案之用。

參議院主席 魏險咎法指定州長為參議院主席的條款。

財政上的影響：對加州地方政府並無直接影響。

稅制：實業課稅評估：修改“累進轉移”的定義，廢除因數成倍而營造成實業課稅。財政上的影響：實業課稅損失重大，增重地方政府的財政負擔。加州政府需要補貼地方學校與社區、大學校，其經費也增加。由於實業課稅額大，降低，加州的所得稅收入也增加。

保釋 如法庭認定犯人如被釋放，可能使別人的身體受到重傷時，犯人不得當然被釋放。財政上的影響：地方政府實行與保釋費用費用增加。犯人稍後被列持坐，可省回一些經費，得以補償。
INCOME TAX INDEXING. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Provides continuing personal income tax brackets adjustments by using full Consumer Price Index percentage changes. Fiscal impact: Reduce state revenues by about $230 million in 1982-83, $445 million in 1983-84, and increasing amounts thereafter. State revenue reductions would result in corresponding reductions in state payments to local governments and schools.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE. Amends Constitution and enacts statutes concerning procedures, sentencing, and release of accused and convicted persons and regarding victims. Fiscal impact: Major state and local costs which cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty.

WATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PERIPHERAL CANAL. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, a law designating additional Central Valley Project water facilities. Fiscal impact: Under present policies, no increase in state taxes or reduction in funds for other state programs required. Potential construction costs at 1981 prices are in excess of $3.1 billion plus unknown additional costs to be financed by increased user charges.

REAPPORTIONMENT. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature adopting boundaries for 45 Congressional districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $250,000 and county costs of $350,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. SENATE DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 40 Senate districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $370,000 and county costs of $500,000.

REAPPORTIONMENT. ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS. “Yes” vote approves, “No” vote rejects, statute enacted by 1981 Legislature revising boundaries of 80 Assembly districts. Fiscal impact: If approved, no state or local costs. If rejected, state costs of $400,000 and county costs of $650,000.

ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE
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REAJUSTE DEL IMPUESTO A LA RENTA. ESTATUTO DE INICIATIVA.
Calcula el costo total de los aumentos del impuesto a la renta personal usando una fórmula que mede los cambios de precio en el costo de vida del indexador de precios de Councilman. En efecto fiscal: Reducir el costo total de los aumentos en 830 millones en 1982-83, en 844 millones en 1983-84 y en cantidades ascendentes de 85 millones en el año siguiente. Reducción en los costos estatales correspondientes a las reducciones correspondientes en las pagas estatales a los gobiernos y sus entidades locales.

JUSTICIA PENAL. Elimina la Constitución y promulga estatutos con respecto a los procedimientos, antecedentes y disculpas de personas acusadas y condenadas así como a las víctimas. Impuesto fiscal: Costos estatales a las localidades que no puedan ser pagados con el ingreso de valor de compensación.

INSTALACIONES HIDRÁULICAS INCLUYENDO EL CANAL PERIFÉRICO. Un voto "sí" aprueba, un voto "no" rechaza, un voto "caja" revoca, un voto "Máquina" mantenga. Impuesto fiscal: Los costos presupuestados se incrementan a los fondos estatales, los cuales son libres de aranceles. Los costos adicionales que se desconozcan, serán financiados por el incremento del costo a los consumidores.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS CONGRESIONALES. Un voto "sí" aprueba, un voto "no" rechaza, exige promulgación por la Legislatura de 1982, que adopte los límites para los 45 distritos Congresionales. Impuesto fiscal: Si es aprobar, se rechaza, si es rechazada, se paga la cantidad de $250,000 a los consejeros.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS SENATORIALES. Un voto "sí" aprueba, un voto "no" rechaza, esté promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que revise los límites de los 40 distritos Senatoriales. Impuesto fiscal: Si es aprobar, se rechaza, se paga la cantidad de $270,000 a los consejeros.

REDISTRIBUCIÓN, DISTRITOS DE LA ASAMBLEA. Un voto "sí" aprueba, un voto "no" rechaza, esté promulgado por la Legislatura de 1981, que revise los límites de los 80 distritos de la Asamblea. Impuesto fiscal: Si es aprobar, se rechaza, se paga la cantidad de $400,000 a los consejeros.
### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**A** Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?  
- **YES** 263
- **NO** 264

**B** Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?  
- **YES** 267
- **NO** 268

**C** Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?  
- **YES** 271
- **NO** 272

**D** Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employee in the Health Service System?  
- **YES** 274
- **NO** 275

**E** Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?  
- **YES** 278
- **NO** 279

**F** Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?  
- **YES** 281
- **NO** 282

**G** Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller's auditing powers?  
- **YES** 285
- **NO** 286

---

**ON YOUR VOTING MACHINE**  
**THIS PAGE WILL BE GREEN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>OTRO</th>
<th>DE PALABRAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>贊成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>反对</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.** ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisoras tomar el poder de prestar dinero a través de la emisión de papeles debidos a los impuestos, sin tomar en cuenta el gasto del dinero?  
市参議会議案有無借陳，依照地法律或市参議会議案發行債券或債券？

**B.** ¿Se deberá permitir a la Junta de Supervisoras ordenar el Registro de Electores que lleva a cabo el censo municipal general, decisión a la que se refiere en el artículo 10.21, apartado B?  
市参議会議案否準許出選民冊管理於郵寄形式或特別市選？

**C.** ¿Deberá la ciudad contribuir a un plan de salud para los empleados de la ciudad que sería una contribución promedio de los dos candidatos del estado que tienen la población más grande?  
市府應否否為市職工級付醫保健康費，保費額為加州人口最衆之十個縣區的平均健康費？

**D.** ¿Deberá la ciudad abonar a los trabajadores de los sistemas de jubilaciones que están pensando en jubilarse en el futuro en la misma forma en que la ciudad abonará a los empleados activos en Jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?  
市府應否否在同一基礎上補貼在職員工和已退休員工的未亡配偶，一如市府應否否在健保服務制度內的在職員工和已退休員工？

**E.** ¿Deberá permitir el abono de jubilaciones a los miembros del Sistema de Jubilaciones que están pensando en jubilarse en el futuro en el mismo porcentaje que el futuro jubilado recibió anteriormente del aumento de sus ingresos después de los 60 años de edad?  
退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶，目前可享受補貼金，如他們在六十歲後再婚，應否繼續享受這種補貼金？

**F.** ¿Deberá llevarse a cabo investigación de actos de abuso o de experiencia del sistema de Jubilaciones como han sido determinados por la Junta de Jubilaciones con el fin del actuar llevado a cabo por la misma cada dos años y que claramente sean pagados con las contribuciones de la ciudad?  
退休制度的保險統計和人壽調查，應否每兩年樂行一次，由退休局覈定保險金額和某些費用，由市政府支付？

**G.** ¿Deberá la Junta de Jubilaciones tener la autoridad exclusiva de administrar las pensiones de los jubilados sujetos a los gastos de revisión del Contralor?  
退休局應否否具有唯一的權力，以管理退休金用於投資，但須受市審計官審核的約束？
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors' member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member's pleasure?</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisory election assume the office of President of the Board?</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-83, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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三藩市地方普選
初選  一九八二年六月八日

288 SI 贊成
289 NO 反對

292 SI 贊成
293 NO 反對

296 SI 贊成
297 NO 反對

300 SI 贊成
301 NO 反對

303 SI 贊成
304 NO 反對

307 SI 贊成
308 NO 反對

310 SI 贊成
311 NO 反對

保健服務局的組織和職能是否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退職職工，由市議會的成員推薦，而市議會的成員則由市議會議決？

退休局的組織和職能是否改變以增加兩名成員，一名由市長指派，一名退職職工，由市議會的成員推薦，而市議會的成員則由市議會議決？

退休局的指派－總經理職位是否由退休局任命，並將獲得公務者資格，該經理並有權任命一名執行人員，在他的指导下執行職務？

市議員應否各自任命一名立法助理，在市議員的掌管下工作？

在一九八零年十一月市議員選舉中得票最多的市議員，應否出任市議員會主席，並在一九八三年六月八日及此後每隔兩年一次，在上一次市議員選舉中得票最多的候選人出任市議員會主席？

政策聲明： 三藩市、縣議會在一九八二一九八三年度財政年度按一部投資電子計算機，以備三藩市執法人員之用？

政策聲明： 三藩市人民議會對太平洋電公司最近的加價，並敦促公用事業委員會把電費壓低到一九八一年十二月一日的水平，並要求採取其他糾正行動？
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—Who can vote?
A—You can vote at this election only if you are registered to vote by May 10, 1982.

Q—Who can register to vote?
A—You can register to vote if you:
\( \bullet \) are at least 18 years of age on election day.
\( \bullet \) are a citizen of the United States.
\( \bullet \) are a resident of California, and
\( \bullet \) are not imprisoned or on parole for the conviction of a felony.

Q—How do I register?
A—Phone the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—If I have been convicted of a crime, can I sign up to vote?
A—Yes, if you have served your sentence and parole.

Q—Do I have to belong to a political party?
A—Only if you want to. If you don’t want to tell what political party you consider yours, you can say “Independent” or “I don’t want to tell.”

Q—If I don’t tell my political party when I sign up, can I still vote in every election?
A—Yes, The only thing you cannot vote on is which candidate will be a political party’s choice in a primary election. Example: Only people who sign up as Democrats can vote in the primary election for who will be the Democratic candidate. Primary elections are held in June of even-numbered years.

Q—If I have picked a party, can I change it later?
A—Yes, but you must register again.

Q—If I have moved since I last voted, must I register again?
A—Yes.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, June 8, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—What candidates will voters be choosing at this primary election?
A—All voters who are registered as members of a political party will choose a candidate for:
\( \bullet \) State Assemblyman
\( \bullet \) United States Congressman
\( \bullet \) United States Senator
\( \bullet \) State Senator if you live in Senate District 8.
\( \bullet \) Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of Board of Equalization, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Judges, Assessor and Public Defender.
\( \bullet \) and you will choose members of County Central Committees.

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
\( \bullet \) three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
\( \bullet \) two State Senate Districts (SD 5,6)
\( \bullet \) two U.S. Congressional Districts (CD 8,3)
(See map on the cover of this pamphlet)

Q—What about the United State Senator? Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—You can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the San Francisco Voters’ Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this primary election?
A—This handbook deals only with City candidates and issues. Information on State candidates and propositions is in the State voters’ handbook.

Q—Are there any candidates for non-partisan office?
A—Yes, there are candidates for Assessor, Public Defender, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and for offices of municipal and superior court judges.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
\( \bullet \) Going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime from May 10 through June 8 this year
or
\( \bullet \) mailing in the application sent with this voters’ pamphlet requesting an absentee ballot.

Q—What can I do if I do not have an application form?
A—You can send a letter or postcard asking for an absentee ballot. This letter or postcard should be sent to the Registrar of Voters, City Hall, San Francisco 94102. It must be received in the Registrar’s Office at least by June 1 this year.

Q—What do I say when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
\( \bullet \) That you need to vote early
\( \bullet \) your registered voting address
\( \bullet \) the address where you want the ballot mailed
\( \bullet \) then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, June 8, 1982.
Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employee must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed next to your name and address sent with this Voters' Pamphlet (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least fourteen days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.
When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time of the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.

You must reregister whenever you move
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

PRIMARY ELECTION — This is an election to decide who will be a political party's candidate for the general election the following November. There may be two or more people wanting to be a party's candidate in November. The one who gets the highest vote in the primary election will be this candidate. Because the purpose of a primary election is to choose a POLITICAL PARTY'S CANDIDATE you will vote for candidates in the party in which you are registered. A voter who has registered as an independent and has not chosen a political party will receive a primary ballot that lists ONLY ballot measures and non-partisan candidates.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions.

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See page 00.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polling place to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 2. If it deals with the city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

TAX ANTICIPATION NOTE — A method by which the City borrows money from private lenders to pay expenses before taxes are collected. The Tax Anticipation Note is paid back with interest from tax money that is collected the same year the note is issued.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve-month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — A charter amendment changes one of the basic laws contained in the Charter. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition. Propositions passed by initiative can be changed only by another vote of the people.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

SUPERVISORS — The Board of Supervisors makes the laws for San Francisco, and approves all money spent by the city government. The Board of Supervisors adopts the city budget but does not control the budgets of the Community College or the School District. The Supervisors can put propositions on the ballot for people to vote on. Supervisors are paid $9,600 per year.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
SAM DUCA

My address is 16 Wawona Street
My occupation is Assessor, City & County of San Francisco
My qualifications for office are: Elected your Assessor in 1978. Served in a professional administrative capacity in Assessor's Office for 27 years. I have two University degrees and the coveted MAI designation. Served in advisory capacity both nationally and internationally on property tax administration problems. Urged state laws to continue fair and equal treatment for all. Will continue to seek tax relief for homeowners, renters and senior citizens. Member of Community Board of St. Mary's Hospital, Operating Board of the USO, Director of Villa Carina Home for the Aged, President of the Bay Area Assessors' Association.

The Sponsors for Sam Duca are:
Cyril I. Magin, 994 California St., Merchant
Henry B. Bermack, 483 Euclid Ave., Merchant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., Member Board of Equalization
Stan Smith, 411 Felton, Union Official
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Constance O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Jane McCaskill Murphy, 2255 Washington St., Retired, Social Worker
Lee Vavrus, 91 Camo, Retired Judge, Superior Court
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Youth Director
Tess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Newspaper Publisher
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Joe Ling Jong, 1269 Hyde St., Restaurant Owner
Erma W. Lesca, 1257 Jackson, Housewife
Salvatore Reina, 1130 Union St., Public Relations
H. Melvin Fyna, 76 Venus, Public Accounting
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Univ. S.F.
Walter H. Shorenstein, 740 El Camino Del Mar, Real Estate Executive
James J. Rudkin, 140 Chenery Corp. Exec.
Thomas J. Mellon, 310 Arballo, Exec. V.P. S.F. Exec. Park
William K. Cohlens, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
William T. Reed, 2511 18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Sally B. Famarin, 2207 28th Ave., Real Estate
Lucia Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Civil Engineer
William Maskovitz, 1177 California St., Retired
Eugene L. Friend, 2910 Lake St., Merchant
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Elizabeth Duca, 16 Wawona St., Housewife

JEFF BROWN

My address is 850 - 40th Avenue
My occupation is Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: The Public Defender provides legal representation to people accused of crime who have no money to hire a private lawyer. Our Constitution requires that the defense be zealous and competent.

As your Public Defender I have selected a staff of talented, hard-working lawyers. I have insisted on the highest professional standards. These efforts have made equal justice under the law more of a reality in San Francisco than ever before.

I seek re-election to continue the work which will make our Public Defender's Office a model of serious, responsible and effective legal representation.

The Sponsors for Jeff Brown are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Buck Bogot, 439 Holly Park Circle, Organizer
Henry E. Bermack, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Wui Yung Brown, 850 40th Ave., Housewife
Wilson Chang, 820 Filbert, Business Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight, Deputy Sheriff
Carlota Tixidor Del Jorillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Civil Service Commissioners
Tess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Businessman
Diane Feinsteine, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor City & County of San Francisco
Wayne Friday, 1905 14th St., Businessman/Writer
Linda T. Fries, 930 35th Ave., Community Organizer
Ricardo Hernandez, 40 Harper St., Exec. Seaty, Rent Control Board
Mortie J. Jackson, 524 Belvedere St., Business Manager
Andrea J. Johnson, 1334 Masonic, Director of Development
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Ln., Regional Director, ILWU
Cyril Magin, 999 California, Retailer
Edward T. Mancuso, 520 Crestlake Dr., Retired Public Defender
Ephraim Morgelin, 60 Scenic Way, Attorney
John D. Monahan, 31 Grandview Ave., Retired
Robert Nicco, 74 Cervantes Blvd., Retired Public Defender
Bernard A. Orsl, 500 Magellan, Businessman
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner
Bob Ross, 4200 20th St., Newspaper Publisher
Hadle Redd, 476 Jeos Ave., Investigator
Stanley L. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Tito Torres, 3921 19th, Attorney
Yori Waia, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, Community College Board
George Wong, 120 Ellis St., Chair, Commission On The Aging

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.
Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.
My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz.

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD TULLIS

My occupation is Deputy Attorney General of California.
My education and qualifications are: Honors graduate from San Francisco State and University of San Francisco Law School. For nine years, I have handled criminal and civil cases at all levels of both state and federal courts. I have been a criminal prosecutor for the past six years. This experience gives me the knowledge and perspective to be a strong and effective judge.
Our court system too often ignores the rights of crime victims and operates as a revolving door for repeat offenders. I support measures to:
- Guarantee victims a voice at sentencing.
- Require that convicted criminals take responsibility for their crimes by restoring losses to victims.
- Tighten bail and sentencing for serious offenders.
As judge, I will protect the rights of victims and the public while ensuring speedy and fair trials.
Supporters: Seven past Presidents, San Francisco Bar Association; Judge Ina Levin Gyemant; former Assessor Joseph Tinney; former Supervisor Peter Tamatas; Commissioners Melvin Lee, Sally Famatin and Walter Jebe; Attorneys Catherine Duggan, Robert Granucci, Fred Furth, Joseph Martin, Benjamin James, Eulalio Frausto, Edward Jew and Arlo Hale Smith; Mark Forrester, Mervyn Silberberg, Al Giannini, Mike Garza, Roger Miles, Henry Schindel, Sam Jordan, Jeane Schmidt, Jack Tufts, Wady Ayoob, Ray Leavitt, John Behanna, Patrick Fitzgerald.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
RICHARD E. BEST

My age is 39 years
My occupation is Assistant Superior Court Commissioner
My education and qualifications are: Columbia University School of Law, 1968; five years private law practice; eight years judicial experience; married, two children, residing at 142 Cervantes.

As commissioner and Temporary Judge of the Superior Court for eight years, I've handled complex civil litigation and Juvenile Court matters. I've lectured at law schools including U.S.F., authored legal publications, and taught legal seminars for attorneys. In 1980, I received the San Francisco Barristers Club award for exemplary contribution to legal education.

The public deserves firm, impartial, and consistent application of law, protection of the innocent, and punishment of the guilty. We must be safe and secure at home and in public, be vigilant in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and receive equal justice under law.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
Office Number 1
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Assistant District Attorney
My education and qualifications are: A native San Franciscan. I graduated from St. Ignatius in 1957 and USF in 1961. Receiving my law degree from Lincoln University Law School, I was admitted to the bar in 1967. I practiced general law, civil litigation and criminal defense, with extensive trial experience. I was appointed Deputy District Attorney in 1970 and taught at local law schools. Having served under three District Attorneys, I am presently Assistant Chief. My court experience includes more than 125 jury trials and over 1,000 Municipal Court preliminary hearings, appearances in every Municipal and Superior Court and before nearly every judge. I am supported by the last two elected Public Defenders, criminal defense attorneys, members of law enforcement and a broad cross section of San Franciscans. I am active in several civic organizations.


Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
Tax Anticipation Notes

PROPOSITION A
Shall the Board of Supervisors have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes in the manner provided by state law or pursuant to ordinance of the Board of Supervisors?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When funds needed for authorized expenses are not available from the City’s cash reserve or other city departments, the City has the power to issue Tax Anticipation Notes. These notes may be issued in an amount up to 25% of the taxes due that year. They are paid from taxes received that fiscal year. Notes are issued to the lowest bidder, and the interest shall not be more than 6%.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A no longer requires the City to borrow first from the cash reserve and then from other city funds before issuing Tax Anticipation Notes. The Board of Supervisors would issue Tax Anticipation Notes under State law or City ordinance.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the power to borrow money by issuing Tax Anticipation Notes without having to borrow first from the cash reserve or other city departments.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to issue Tax Anticipation Notes only if money is not available from the cash reserve or other city departments.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would not affect the cost of government. However, the difference between the cost of borrowing and interest earned through tax anticipation note proceeds could result in net revenues to the City and County of San Francisco, the amount of which, being dependent on future interest rates and legislative action, cannot be determined at this time.”

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP. A BEGINS ON PAGE 28.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A “YES” vote will allow San Francisco to raise a minimum of $5,000,000 annually, without raising taxes.

Tax anticipation notes allow California Counties to issue to investors short-term notes, which carry low interest, but interest exempt from income tax. The notes are issued against anticipated tax revenue, and must be paid off within the year, as taxes are paid. The County can then invest the money received in high interest Treasury and bank accounts. The County keeps the difference between the two interest rates. The investor benefits because the interest on the notes is tax exempt. (Essentially this is a tax shift from the federal government to local government).

Other counties in California and several States (Montana, New York) have been issuing these notes for several years. San Francisco’s charter permits tax anticipation notes but only as a way to solve cash flow problems. San Francisco cannot, without the minor Charter amendment in Proposition “A”, use tax anticipation notes to earn revenue for the City.

A “YES” vote on Proposition “A” means money to permit San Francisco to continue to provide quality services to all of its citizens.

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION “A”.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition “A”.

Proposition “A” is designed to save money for the City. “A” involves no new taxes, it increases no fees, costs none of us a penny.

What Proposition “A” does is to allow the Board of Supervisors to arrange for public short-term financing in order to equalize the City’s cash flows, rather than to borrow from other funds which are more prudently invested elsewhere. The net effect will be to make our cash flow better balanced and to increase our General Fund interest income and/or reduce our General Fund interest costs.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

This permits the City to sell income tax free, virtually risk free, TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES to wealthy investors, then loan this money out to others at much higher interest rates and thereby generate additional municipal revenue.

It’s an outrageous “rip off” of the Federal government, nevertheless, until Congress “wises up” and repeals this ludicrous law, San Francisco may as well take advantage of it. Reluctantly, a YES recommendation.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROPOSITION A WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.304 Disbursements in Advance of Revenues

The board of supervisors, by annual tax levy, may gradually build up the cash reserve fund authorized and created by the provisions of section 6.306 of this charter. Said fund shall be used exclusively (1) for the payment in any fiscal year of legally budgeted expenditures for such year in anticipation of the collection, after the close of such fiscal year, of legally collectible taxes and other revenues, as set forth in the budget and the appropriation ordinance for such fiscal year, and (2) for paying that portion of the authorized expenses of the city and county for any fiscal year, which, as certified to said board by the controller, becomes due and payable and must be paid prior to the receipt of tax payments for such fiscal year; provided, that such cash reserve fund shall not at any time exceed the estimated expenditures for the first five months of the then current fiscal year, less the amount of estimated revenues and receipts from sources other than tax rate revenues.

In the event that funds are not available in such a cash reserve fund to meet authorized expenditures of any fiscal year, the board of supervisors, on the recommendation of the controller and the mayor, and the written approval of the officer, board or commission responsible for the management and control of the fund from which it is proposed that the temporarily idle balances be transferred or loaned, may, by ordinance, authorize the treasurer to make temporary transfers or loans for specified periods of idle encumbered balances in any fund in his custody, except a pension fund, at not less than the then current rate of interest paid by the banks to the city and county on city and county funds deposited with such banks. Such approval by the officer, board or commission concerned shall specify that the amount proposed to be transferred or loaned from such fund will not be needed for the purpose of such fund prior to the date specified for its return. The fund from which such transfer or loan is made shall be charged or encumbered with the amount of such transfer or loan and such amount shall not be considered as available in such fund for any other appropriation or encumbrance for which any expenditures or payments must be made prior to the date on which the transfer or loan is repaid. Any transfer or loan of a temporarily idle balance made as hereinabove authorized during the first half of any fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 1st day of January of said year, and any transfer or loan made during the remaining one-half of said fiscal year shall be repaid prior to the 15th day of May of said year. Such loans shall be secured by and made solely in anticipation of the collection of taxes levied or to be levied for the current fiscal year, and such loans shall constitute the first demand on and shall be repaid from the first tax collections for such current fiscal year; provided, however, that tax anticipation loans made as hereinafter in this section authorized, shall constitute a prior lien on said taxes levied or to be levied or collected.

((When funds shall be needed for the immediate requirements of the city and county in any fiscal year in accordance with appropriations made as authorized by this charter for such fiscal year, which payments may be made in advance of the receipts of income from such fiscal year, and when funds therefor cannot be made available as hereinbefore in this section authorized, the board of supervisors on the recommendation of the controller and the approval of such recommendation by the mayor, shall have power to borrow money on notes or other evidences of indebtedness on behalf of the city and county. Said power shall be exercised by ordinance or ordinances authorizing the borrowing of said money and the execution of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness. The aggregate amount of such notes or other evidences of indebtedness outstanding and unpaid at any one time during any part of the fiscal year in which said borrowing is made shall not be in excess of 25 per cent of the estimated aggregate amount of all taxes actually levied for such fiscal year. All such notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be offered at public sale by the board of supervisors after not less than two days of advertising, not less than three days after the last day on which such advertising is published. Each such sale shall be made to the bidder offering the lowest rate of interest or whose bid represents the lowest net cost to the city and county; provided, however, that the rate of interest to be paid shall not exceed the sum of six (6) per centum per annum, and full authority is hereby given to said board of supervisors to fix, by resolution, the rate of interest on said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the times and places where the principal sum of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness shall be paid. The principal amount of said notes or other evidence of indebtedness together with the interest thereon, issued and delivered under authority of this section shall be payable exclusively out of the taxes levied and collected by said city and county for the fiscal year during which the same are issued, and shall constitute a first lien and charge against the taxes collected during the half of the fiscal year in which said money shall be borrowed and shall be repaid from the first moneys received from said taxes; and the amount of taxes so levied and collected shall be applied to the payment of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness before any part thereof is used for any other purpose; provided, however, that taxes levied for the payment of principal of, or interest on, any bonded indebtedness of said city and county now outstanding or hereafter created shall be applied to the purpose for which such evidences of indebtedness issued against such tax levies is in fact applied to the payment of the principal and interest of such bonded indebtedness. If at the time said notes or other evidences of indebtedness, or any of them, become due and payable the funds in the city treasury available for the payment thereof shall be insufficient for the payment in full of all of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness than outstanding such funds shall be applied pro rata to the payment of the principal and interest of all of the notes or other evidences of indebtedness then issued and outstanding without preference or priority of any one note over any other by reason of prior issuance, or otherwise. Any of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness

(Continued on page 57)
PROPOSITION B
Shall the Board of Supervisors be allowed to direct the Registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Registrar of Voters conducts general, runoff and special municipal elections by establishing precincts throughout the city. Each precinct has a polling place. The voter either votes at a polling place or by absentee ballot. Municipal elections involve only local issues or local candidates.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B gives the Board of Supervisors the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to hold a municipal election by mail. It requires the Board to set rules for holding municipal elections by mail.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the choice of directing the Registrar of Voters to conduct municipal elections by mail.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want municipal elections to be conducted as they are now, by voters going to polling places on election day or voting by absentee ballot.

Controller’s Statement on “B”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be a net decrease in the cost of government by approximately $200,000 per election.”

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 6-4 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp, Wendy Nelder and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP B APPEARS ON PAGE 57

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
Mail Ballot Elections

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

In 1979, San Francisco taxpayers were forced to spend almost $500,000 for a special election that very few people bothered to vote in.

Proposition “B” will prevent this waste of taxpayers’ dollars.

Voting by mail — successfully tested in other California cities — will not only save money but will also make voting more convenient and increase voter turnout.

Proposition “B” will save San Francisco $200,000 — half the current cost of City elections every time it is used. This figure was determined in studies by the Chief Administrative Officer and Registrar of Voters.

Voting by mail has worked in three major elections in California cities, each time with significant cost savings. In San Diego, mail-in voting cut the cost of an election by 36% when compared to the cost of voting at polling places.

A “YES” vote for Proposition “B” will make it more convenient for San Franciscans to vote. Voting materials and ballots will be mailed at one time to voters, and completed ballots will be mailed free, in pre-stamped envelopes provided with the ballot. This means voters won’t have to stand in lines or rush through the day to vote. This is especially important for people who have to get to work, with busy schedules or transportation problems.

Voting “YES” for Proposition “B” will also increase the number of people who vote in San Francisco elections. The Registrar of Voters estimates that turnout will increase from the current range of 25 to 35 percent in polling places to 55 or 65 percent in mail-in balloting.

In San Diego, turnout was almost double that in previous elections, increasing from 33 to 61 percent. In special district elections in California, turnout has nearly doubled using mail-in balloting.

City officials, voters and observers of the San Diego mail-in election agreed that it worked and that it should be used again.

San Francisco’s taxpayers and voters deserve a break. Vote “YES” on Proposition “B”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it’s possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

JUNE 5, 6 & 7
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress
(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Vote "No" on Proposition B, which would trade the ballot box for a mail box. Proposition B would enable the Board of Supervisors, in City elections, to overturn our traditional method of balloting and call for elections by mail. Specifically, it says the Board "may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election."

Ballots simply would be mailed citywide, and, in elections crucial to the well being of each and every San Franciscan, the way would be open to fraud. Gone would be the strict checks and balances of the precinct polling place — usually a neighborhood garage or a school. There, in a calm setting, each voter must sign in and then be checked off the voting lists by poll-watchers.

Election by mail discards these historic safeguards. Thefts from mail boxes are common enough to raise concerns about unscrupulous agents stealing ballots. The greater danger is that mail-in ballots lessen individual responsibility for exercising, in private, behind the drawn curtains of a voting booth, the right to vote. Instead, mail-in ballots can give inordinate advantage to well-organized special interests. The disciplined political action groups can line up their followers to vote in unison.

Ballot-by-mail supposedly would make voting easier and, therefore, increase the number of voters. However, this did not happen in Berkeley which, in its last municipal election, experimented with mail-in voting, and the turnout fell far below normal.

Balloting-by-mail abandons the protection of the neighborhood polling place. It forsakes the purpose of the voting booth where each vote is equal. And it can be abused in the hands of political manipulators.

Voting is a personal matter, to be exercised freely in the privacy of the voting booth. The secret ballot cast makes secure the constitutional principle of one person — one vote. Voting is a right, not a convenience to be sacrificed by trading the ballot box for a mail box. Vote "No" on Proposition B.

Dianne Feinstein, Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

Don't be misled by visions of sugarplum savings for taxpayers touted by the proponents of Proposition B. Registration requirements in California are so lax that there are thousands of fictitious, deceased and non-resident names on the San Francisco voters' rolls. Our Registrar of Voters has estimated there are 50,000 or more ineligible names on the San Francisco roll. This proposal would open the door to pervasive fraud. Can you imagine how easy it would be for corrupt, unscrupulous power brokers to manipulate ballots mailed to ineligible names and false addresses? San Francisco had one major disclosed voting scandal in 1975. Let's not be fooled into providing opportunity for another one.

VOTE NO ON B

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp
Endorsed by:
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Walter J. O'Donnell
Patrick J. Brady
John J. Barbagelata

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

This proposal is a superbly engineered blueprint for citywide voter fraud! Supervisor Britt and his radical, leftist, Santa Monica based "Committee for Economic Democracy" will likely suggest that we vote by telephone "call in" next! At any cost, protect the confidentiality of your SECRET BALLOT! Vote NO!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION B

What a beautiful device for stuffing the ballot box, thereby diluting your vote. I can think some selfish interest groups that will love it. Vote no!

Darrell J. Salomon,
Civil Service Commissioner
Employee Dental Plan

PROPOSITION C
Shall the city contribute to a dental plan for city employees which would be the average contribution of the ten counties in the state having the largest population?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City does not now contribute to a dental plan for all of its employees.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C requires the City to contribute toward a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered. The amount the City contributes would be the average contribution the ten most populated California counties make to their dental plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees who are not already covered.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to a dental plan for city employees not now covered.

Controller's Statement on "C"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $3,207,000."

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP C BEGINS ON PAGE 57
Employee Dental Plan

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION C

To attract and retain qualified, dedicated workers, the City must improve substandard benefits.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "C". A healthy work force is cost effective.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition "C" was placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors because dental care benefits are not provided to a vast number of our employees, while some eight-thousand employees currently receive some dental care.

Fifty-two of the fifty-eight counties in California, as well as the State of California provide some dental care benefits to their employees. Under the guidelines of Proposition "C", there is no reason why the city and county of San Francisco should not participate in this low cost benefit program. Proposition "C" will correct this very large inequity. It establishes a dental program whereby the City and the employees participate in paying the cost of the program.

In order to recruit and retain qualified employees, the City must be competitive with other jurisdictions by providing at least partial coverage for dental care. Otherwise, the City will continue as a training ground for other municipal governments at a cost far in excess of this dental care program.

Vote yes on Proposition "C", as the cost of the program will be a reasonable one for both the taxpayer and the employees.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
Bob Barry
President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

There is no doubt that San Francisco should provide some level of dental coverage for its City employees to remain competitive with other cities for top quality public servants.

But what's important is that the dental plan be provided at the lowest possible cost to the City and the taxpayer.

Proposition C is the perfect solution. It creates a plan which provides an attractive and fair level of coverage at a very low cost to the City. This is accomplished by providing partial coverage for the employee and exempting the employee's family from the program.

It's a workable and fair solution favored by our City officials, taxpayers, and public employees.

Vote for the best solution. Vote YES on Proposition C.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE FIGHTERS #798
James T. Ferguson, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

After the huge salary increases (40 million, plus) just awarded, it will be like "PULLING TEETH" to get this one past the taxpayers!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System fund for active and retired city employees. The City does not contribute anything for dependents of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D provides that the City contribute to the Health Service System fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000."

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D BEGINS N PAGE 58
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The change that this Charter Amendment will bring about should have been made years ago. There are 1,179 individuals in the Health Service System in the category "Surviving Spouse" and they are not subsidized in any way by the City and County of San Francisco.

The first restriction on a surviving spouse is that he or she, as the dependent of the working member, receives only 50% of the worker's retirement benefit, if the worker was qualified at the date of death; otherwise, only what the worker has contributed to the System. Yet these people must carry on, continuing the rearing of a family or attempting to survive themselves in this prohibitively costly economic environment.

Taxpayers in San Francisco have always been compassionate for the needy, at the polls. The cost of keeping this small group is insignificant. We urge you to give this amendment your full support.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

Endorsed by:
Philip J. Kearney, Former Executive Director, Health Service System
Jaykee Ford, President, Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION D

The Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco strongly endorse and support Proposition "D" subsidizing the surviving spouse of active and retired persons in the Health Service System.

The Health Service Board which administers rates and benefits for active and retired members fully recognizes the financial problem imposed on the spouse of the deceased retired employee, due to run away inflation, and the constant upward trend of the cost-of-living.

When a retired city employee dies, his or her pension is reduced by 50%. This makes it difficult for the beneficiary to pay a high health insurance rate, along with inflated rates for rent, food, heat and other utility expenses.

As a matter of equity and fairness the Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco urges the voters of San Francisco to vote "YES" on Proposition "D".

Jaykee M. Ford, President
Frank Lucibello, Chrm.
Health Service Comm.

Endorsed by:
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinaro, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Richard Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Joseph A. Gaggero, Jr., Community Health Service Board
Harry Paritchen, Community Health Service Board
F. Walter Johnson, Community Health Service Board
James H. Wachob, President, District #8 Democratic Club
James L. Ferguson, President, Firefighters' Local #798
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolton, Board of Supervisors

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System provides for retirement benefits to be paid to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement allowance stops upon the remarriage of the surviving spouse.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that any city employee's surviving spouse aged 60 or older and who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits, unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired city employee. Any benefits that were stopped because a surviving spouse aged 60 or older remarried will be paid from the date they were stopped. These benefits will be refigured to include increases.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a city employee's spouse who remarries after reaching age 60.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefit paid to a surviving spouse stopped upon remarriage.

Controller's Statement on "E"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

“Based on the information from the Retirement System, the potential cost of this proposed Charter amendment cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.”

How Supervisors Voted on "E"
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp, Louise Renne and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At issue in this Charter Amendment is whether the surviving spouse of a retired City employee can remarry at or after 60 years of age without losing the retirement allowance which he or she has been receiving as the benefit-sharing spouse of a retired City employee.

The organization of Retired City Employees of the City and County of San Francisco has sponsored Proposition "E" in order to abolish a discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. This rule places a cruel restriction on elderly people of limited means who would hope to rebuild their lives after bereavement.

Governmental jurisdictions formerly deemed it necessary to terminate retirement allowances for surviving spouses on their remarriage. However, the Social Security; and Federal Retirement Systems have now established that surviving spouses may remarry at age 60 and not lose the benefits as provided by law. More recently, a bill has been passed in Congress that will allow the surviving spouse of a benefit-sharing Railroad Employee retire to remarry after age 60 without losing any dependency and indemnity payments.

It is time for San Francisco to follow suit and allow some financial security to surviving spouses of retired City employees should they desire to remarry following the death of their loved one.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E".

Submitted by: Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Harry G. Britt
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Jaynee N. Ford, President
John J. Simpson, Chairman, Retirement Committee
William T. Reed, Coordinator
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION E WAS SUBMITTED.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it's possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

JUNE 5, 6 & 7

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising"
or "Legal Notices")
Retirement Administrative Costs

PROPOSITION F
Shall actuarial and experience investigation of the Retirement system be made as determined by the the Retirement Board with the actuarial evaluation being made not less than every two years and certain expenses be paid from contributions of the city?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Studies are conducted to see how much money must be paid into the City Retirement Fund by the city and by city employees to pay the pensions established for retired employees. These studies are called actuarial valuations. They cover such factors as average length of service, retirement age, and length of life. Such a study is now required in every even-numbered year. A second study is made, in every odd-numbered year, to see if the system performed as expected. This is called an investigation of the experience of the fund. The expenses of the Retirement Fund are paid from the city's general fund.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition F requires an actuarial valuation not less than once every two years. An investigation of the experience of the fund would be conducted only when the Retirement Board decides it is needed. The expenses of the Retirement Fund would be charged to each city department and included in its contributions to the fund.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund at least every two years. You want an investigation of the experience of the fund only when it is needed. You want each city department to pay its share of the expenses of the Retirement Fund through its contributions to the fund.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want an actuarial valuation of the Retirement Fund every even-numbered year and an investigation of the experience of the fund in every odd-numbered year. You want the expenses of the Retirement Fund to be paid from the city's general fund.

Controller's Statement on "F"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition F:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "F"

On February 1 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition F on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP F APPEARS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION F

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION F

Proposition "F" is designed to correct an outmoded, inefficient method involved in Retirement System actuarial valuation studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans under the jurisdiction of the Retirement Board.

Under the current Charter provisions, the Retirement Board is compelled to make an actuarial valuation study every even-numbered year and an investigation into the experience of the system every odd-numbered year. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary advises that this method is cumbersome and costly, and is not necessary in order for the Board to make proper judgments and decisions relative to the costs of pension benefits.

Proposition "F" will give the Retirement Board, on the advice of its Consulting Actuary, flexibility in scheduling and conducting actuarial valuations studies and investigations into the experience of the various pension plans. It will provide a more efficient and a less costly method utilized in the making of actuarial determinations and related pension plan costs.

Proposition "F" will preserve the fiscal integrity of the Retirement System while, at the same time, streamlining an outmoded and inefficient actuarial process. Proposition "F" is a "no-cost," Charter Amendment.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "F".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinar
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Asha, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION F WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall the Retirement Board have exclusive authority to administer pension monies for investments subject to the Controller’s auditing powers?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City Controller sets up a system of controls for the City Retirement System for the investment of pension money. The Controller also audits the investment records of the retirement system.

PROPOSAL: Proposition G gives the City Retirement Board independent control to administer the investment of pension money. The City Controller would no longer supervise that function but would continue to audit the investment accounts of the Retirement System.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to have independent control over the investment of pension money. You want the City Controller to continue to audit the investment accounts.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Controller to continue to set up a system of controls for the investment of pension money and to audit the investment accounts.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government."

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION G APPEARS ON PAGE 41
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION G

On November 6, 1979, the voters, by an overwhelming margin, authorized the Retirement System to deposit securities and monies with a major financial institution, the purpose being two-fold: to bring about a significant reduction in paperwork and to realize substantial increased interest earnings. Although substantial increased interest earnings have been realized, a corresponding reduction in paperwork and duplication of work activities has not.

Currently, the Retirement System must request the Controller's Office to draw a warrant for the purchase of a stock or bond. The warrant is not put into the banking system to pay for the security purchase. In fact, the warrant never leaves City offices but is "deposited" with the City Treasurer. Payment for purchases is actually made by drawing on the money market (short-term) balances maintained by the Retirement System at its Custodian of funds.

The intent of Proposition "G" is to eliminate the excessive amount of paperwork involved in the receipt and deposit of investment income and in the purchase and sale of securities, as well as to streamline and make more efficient the transaction process involved in the management of the System's investment portfolio.

A "YES" vote on Proposition "G" will provide the Retirement System opportunity to eliminate wasteful administrative and clerical tasks and will relieve the Controller's Office, the Treasurer's Office and the Retirement System of unproductive work time. At the same time, however, Proposition "G" retains the Controller's unquestioned authority to audit all of the System's accounts and records and the assets of the System on deposit.

Proposition "G" is a "no-cost" Charter Amendment. VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "G".

Submitted by:  
Supervisor John L. Molinari  
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto  
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker  
Supervisor Lee S. Dolson  
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

Endorsed by:  
Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco  
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions are in bold-face type; all sections are entirely additional.

6.314 Investment of Pension Monies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except for those contained in Section 3.303, the retirement board shall have the exclusive authority to administer, receive, hold and disburse pension monies for the making of legal investments. (end)
**Health Service Board Composition**

**PROPOSITION H**

Shall the composition of the Health Service Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by the retired members and the supervisors’ member to be appointed by the Board of Supervisors?

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** There are seven members on the Health Service Board. The members are chairman of the finance committee of the Board of Supervisors, the City Attorney, two persons appointed by the mayor and three members of the Health Service System elected by the active members of that system.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition H increases the Health Service Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The City Attorney would remain a member. The Mayor would appoint three members instead of two. Three active members of the Health Service System would still be elected by the active members. The retired members of the Health Service System would elect a new member from the retired members of that system.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to increase the Health Service Board from seven to nine members.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Health Service Board as it is now.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “H”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition “H”:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Health Service Board.”

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “H”**

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


**NO:** Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

---

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 60
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

Of the 70,000 members being serviced by the Health Service Board, approximately 15,600 are retirees and their dependents, and we believe that this substantial number of people should have a representative on the Health Service Board to monitor its actions and become involved in its deliberations.

We feel that the rates and policies adopted by the board affect the lives and health of the retirees and their families just as much, if not more so, than the active employees, so it would be only fair and equita-

ble that a retirees' representative be allowed to sit on the Health Service Board.

As a matter of equity and fairness, the Board of Supervisors urges the voters of San Francisco to vote “YES” on Proposition “H”.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, Tuesday, June 8th. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 8 de junio. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Retirement Board Composition

PROPOSITION I
Shall the composition of the Retirement Board be changed by adding two members, one to be appointed by the Mayor and one retired employee elected by retired members and the supervisors' member be changed from President to a member appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the civil service appointment of the Secretary-General Manager be deleted?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There are seven members on the Retirement Board. The members are the president of the Board of Supervisors, three persons appointed by the mayor and three persons elected by the active members of the Retirement System from that system. The Secretary-General Manager, who manages the system, is hired under the Civil Service System.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I increases the Retirement Board from seven to nine members. The Board of Supervisors member would be appointed by the Board. The mayor would appoint four persons instead of three. Three active members of the Retirement System would still be elected by the active members. One new member who is retired would be elected by retired employees. The position of Secretary-General Manager would no longer be subject to Civil Service. Procedures for filling the mayor's appointments would be changed.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to increase the Retirement Board from seven to nine members and remove the position of Secretary-General Manager from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep a seven member Retirement Board and keep the position of Secretary-General Manager under Civil Service.

Controller's Statement on "I"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

"Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $8,000 each time an election is held to select a Retired Employee Representative to the Retirement Board."

How Supervisors Voted on "I"

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition I on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Louise Renne.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I APPEARS ON PAGE 61
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The latest Annual Report (1980-81) of the Retirement System indicates that there are 12,681 retirees and survivors being serviced by the System. In the interests of fairness, we believe a representative of the retired employees should be a member of the Retirement Board.

A retiree on the Board would help to assure that the pension fund is properly administered and that sound investment policy decisions are made.

Several other retirement systems in the State of California have a retiree representative on their boards. In the interest of equal representation, the San Francisco Retirement Board should also have a retiree member.

Submitted by: Supervisor Lee S. Dolson
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION I

Why bother?
That's right. Why bother to change a system that works?

At present, the Retirement Board is run by 3 city employees elected by their peers, 3 qualified citizens appointed by the Mayor and represented by the President of the Board of Supervisors. The daily administration of the system is performed by a Secretary-General Manager who is in the Civil Service System.

This unnecessary Proposition adds two positions to the Board, increasing the bureaucracy needlessly, and removes the Secretary-General Manager from the ranks of Civil Service, the very service he helps administer for retirement purposes. Further, it injects politics into the system by allowing another Mayoral appointment.

Let's not add more weight to an already heavy government bureaucracy.

Vote NO on PROPOSITION “I”

COMMITTEE FOR A SOUND RETIREMENT
James T. Ferguson
PROPOSITION J
Shall the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System be appointed by the Retirement Board and be exempt from civil service and said Manager be allowed to appoint an executive secretary to serve at his pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Secretary-General Manager, who is the chief executive officer of the Retirement System, is appointed under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Secretary-General Manager. The Secretary-General Manager may appoint an Executive Secretary. Both positions would be exempt from Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Retirement Board to appoint its Secretary-General Manager. You want the Secretary-General Manager to be able to appoint an Executive Secretary. You want both of these positions to be exempt from Civil Service.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Secretary-General Manager of the Retirement System to remain under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “J”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, in and of itself, it would have no effect on the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “J”
On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-1 on the question of placing Proposition J on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisor Quentin Kopp.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 47
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION J

The Retirement Board currently administers an investment portfolio in excess of one billion dollars. In addition, the Board administers plan benefits whose costs exceed $125 million annually, plus administration of worker compensation benefits exceeding $10 million annually. The Board’s financial and fiduciary responsibilities make it imperative that the Board’s chief executive officer be responsible to the Board to effectively carry out Board policy.

Proposition "J" will give the Retirement Board authority to appoint a chief executive officer and, in turn, make it permissible for the chief executive office to appoint an executive secretary. Both positions, however, shall remain subject to the salary standardization provisions of the Charter.

Proposition "J" is neither precedent-setting nor does it reflect adversely on the Civil Service System. Consider the following:

1. The chief executive officer of the Retirement System, including the current incumbent, has always been appointive.
2. With the rare exception of the Retirement Board,

the Charter allows all mayoral boards and commissions, including the Civil Service Commission and the Health Service Board, to appoint their chief executive officer.

3. The Charter currently allows the Retirement Board to appoint the Actuary and a Consulting Actuary.

The principal intent of Proposition "J" is to give the Retirement Board the same authority enjoyed by all boards and commissions — the right to appoint a chief executive officer who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The nature and scope of the fiscal responsibilities inherent in the activities of the Retirement Board requires careful and judicious selection of a chief executive officer, a person who will effectively administer and implement board policy.

Finally, Proposition "J" is a "no-cost" proposal and will not add to the cost of government.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "J".

Submitted by: Supervisor John L. Molinari
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Endorsed by: Retirement Board of City and County of San Francisco
Peter D. Ashe, President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.671 Functions, Powers and Duties

The retirement board shall be the sole authority and judge, under such general ordinances as may be adopted by the supervisors, as to the conditions under which members may receive and may continue to receive benefits of any sort under the retirement system, and shall have exclusive control of the administration of the system and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, provided that all investments shall be of the character legal for insurance companies of California.

3.672 Secretary-General Manager and Actuary

The retirement board shall appoint a secretary-general manager and an actuary, who shall hold office at its pleasure, and the board shall employ a consulting actuary. The secretary-general manager or ((actuary)) any other person designated by the secretary-general manager shall have the power to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to the business of the retirement system.

The secretary-general manager may appoint an executive secretary who shall serve at the pleasure of the secretary-general manager.

The secretary-general manager, actuary and executive secretary positions shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter, except that the compensation of the positions shall be as provided by the salary standardization provisions of the charter.

The provisions of this section shall be deemed to be amendatory of charter section 3.670 relating to the appointment of the secretary-general manager whether heretofore existing or contained in section 3.670 amended in other respects concurrently with the adoption of this amendment. (end)
Supervisors' Aides Exemption

PROPOSITION K
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors appoint one legislative aide who shall serve at the member’s pleasure?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: Each member of the Board of Supervisors has one administrative assistant who is appointed by the Supervisor and one legislative aide who is hired under Civil Service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K allows each member of the Board of Supervisors to appoint the legislative aide. The legislative aide would no longer be under Civil Service.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be able to appoint a legislative aide.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the legislative aides to the Supervisors to continue to be hired under Civil Service.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

“Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would no affect the cost of government.”

How Supervisors Voted on “K”

On February 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 9-2 on the question of placing Proposition K on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP K APPEARS ON PAGE 49
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Each member of the Board of Supervisors has a staff of two: an Administrative Aide and a Legislative Aide. The Charter currently provides for an Administrative Aide to be appointed by each member of the Board and to serve at his or her pleasure. Legislative Aides are to be hired from Civil Service lists.

The Civil Service Commission, however, has never developed nor administered an examination for the position, and Legislative Aides are appointed to temporary status by the Supervisor for whom they work. Proposition "K" would not change this procedure. It would simply change the Charter to reflect the actual appointment procedure.

Because of the nature of the position, there is a tremendous turnover. An examination, which would be expensive to design, would also be costly to administer so frequently.

In the interest of economy and efficiency, vote "YES" on this proposal.

Submitted by: Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Harry G. Britt

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

This just formalizes the existing situation, and adds nothing to the City's costs. Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION K

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.203-3 Administrative Assistants and Legislative Aides to Members of the Board of Supervisors.
Notwithstanding any other provision or limitations of this charter, specifically section 8.300, there may be one (1) administrative assistant and one (1) legislative aide for each member of the board of supervisors, each of ((who)) whom shall be appointed by the member and shall serve at the member's pleasure. These individuals shall be responsible for such duties and responsibilities as the member shall prescribe.

(end)
Board of Supervisors Presidency

PROPOSITION L
Shall the supervisor who received the most votes in the November 1980 supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board and on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the candidate receiving the most votes at the last preceding supervisorial election assume the office of President of the Board?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: In 1980 the voters changed the election of the Board of Supervisors from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. The Board elects one of its members president every two years in January of even-numbered years or 14 months after the election.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L provides that the Supervisor who received the highest number of votes in the November 4, 1980 election, becomes president of the Board. After that, on January 8, 1983 and every second year thereafter the Supervisor who receives the highest number of votes in the last election would automatically become president of the Board.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the supervisorial election to become president of the Board of Supervisors in January following the election.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the Board of Supervisors to elect a president from among its members one (1) year after newly elected members of the Board take office.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

"Should the initiative petition be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP L APPEARS ON PAGE 52

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We expected when we went to the polls to elect members of the Board of Supervisors that the top votegetter, whoever that was, would be president of the Board. That healthy tradition was flouted. That’s why we must write it into the law.

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Bob Guichard
George Rehmet,
Concerned Voters of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Judge Byron Arnold (ret.)
Melba Ahbrom
Frank Aiello
Cheryl Areson
Robert Areson
Duke Armstrong
Alfred Bayluc
Robert Battchelor
Joseph Bell
Adeline Borello
Mary Anne Brennan

Hermine Johnson
Olga Johnson
Frances Keegan
Marion Kelly
Bernie Kelly
Patrick Kelly
Donald Kennedy
Elie Kuersten
Ginger Lowe
David Lyons
John Mack
Nevia Madow
Wallace Marenko
Patricia Montana
Irene Moresko

Joyce Brown
Marian Calhoun
Donald Casper
Gino Cecchi
Elizabeth Concklin
Margaret Connolly
Erwin Delman
Ono Dennett
Melba Dent
Anne Denisschman
Patrick Dowling
Marygrace Dunn
Richard Dunn
Thomas Dunne
Ethel Fash
Peter Fatooh
Martin Feldhauer
Elizabeth Fellhauer
Christopher Fleming
Thomas Flynn
Fern Gladden
Thomas Glynn
Paul Grell
Victoria Grell
Alma Gumbinger
Daniel Hayes
Joanne Hayes
Patricia Hayes
Nancy Hsu

Ethel Martin
Joe Meda Polid
Anne McGurver
Nancy McGurver
Thomas McGarvey
Mildred Mortenson
Chris Murphy
Walter O’Donnell
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr.
Leser O’Shea
Charles Owens
Louise Park
Stefani Phipps
Al Roenach
Martin Ruane
Harriet Salerno
Nicholas A. Sapunar
Richard Schindler
Dale Seesee
Hazel Smith
Christopher Sullivan
Clarice Svooboa
Richard Steto
James Timositi
Fritz Tofil
John Van Heusden
Alexandra Vukstich
Dorothy Vukstich
Raymond Vukstich
Richard Wett

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Since World War II the top votegetter in the election for supervisors has been named president of the Board of Supervisors. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of votes have been cast with the expectation that this practice would be followed. So consistent has been the respect paid to this tradition that many San Franciscans believed it to be part of City law.

Last year, however, certain supervisors chose to ignore this tradition thereby evidencing the need to protect the top votegetter tradition from future infringement. To this end, thousands of San Franciscans signed petitions to place on the ballot this charter amendment so as to write this tradition into permanent law.

VOTE YES ON L

The top votegetter tradition, like all traditions, was instituted and honored because it proved to serve a real need. It has:

- Lent predictability and stability to our system of local government;
- Avoided the kind of backroom political wheeling and dealing, and corrosive bickering that prompted the custom in the first place (just note the 1980 Speakership battle in the California Assembly to appreciate the contribution of the top votegetter tradition in assuring a smooth and continuous operation of legislative government);
- Given the people a direct say in the policy direction they want the Board to take;
- Inhibited any one member from monopolizing power for extended periods by requiring election of a new Board president every two years; and
- Allowed a popular vote to determine who stands next in the Charter’s designated line of succession for Mayor in the event the latter is unable to complete the prescribed term of office.

DON’T LET THEM ROB YOU OF YOUR POWER TO DECIDE WHO SHOULD BE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

VOTE YES ON L

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

Endorsed by:
Joseph Allen
Angela Barbagelata
Al Burice
George Evangelovich, Union official
Merna Fontes, Lake Merced Independent
Terry Francois, Former Supervisor
Paul Hardman, The Voice
Tom Hayes
Joseph Hurley, Union official
Marlimer McInerny, Retired Deputy Police Chief
John Moyaian, Union official
Supervisor Wendy Nelder
Bernie Orsi
Lester O’Shea
Sun Smith, Union official
Joseph Tinney, Former Assessor
Jack Webb, Charter Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST OF PROPOSITION L

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.

Every County Board of Supervisors in California elects its own president — every City Council in California without an elected Mayor also elects its own chair. The California Assembly elects its own speaker.

If the truth is to be told, it was not until the 1940's that the top vote-getter was elected president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Before then, the President of the Board was chosen by his peers, and was a member with many years of service on the Board.

In 1940, Supervisor Shannon was elected President of the Board — he had been the top vote-getter in 1936, but was not elected president until 1940. Supervisor Gallagher was the top vote-getter in 1942, but it was not until 1946 that he was elected President of the Board.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

In the 136 years that San Francisco has had an elected body — either the Ayuntamiento, the Council, or the Board of Supervisors — for only 38 years has the top vote-getter been elected president. In 98 of those years, the Board has elected one of its own, with seniority on the Board, as the president. But the person has seldom been the top vote-getter.

Should the people of San Francisco preserve tradition? There is nothing inherently wrong with tradition. Let us preserve the tradition of allowing the Supervisors to choose the best of their number to preside at their meetings.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION "L".

Submitted by:
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
Supervisor Nancy G. Walker
Supervisor Doris M. Ward
Supervisor Louise H. Renne

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION L

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.202 President and Committees of the Board
((The supervisors constituting the new board shall on January 8, 1982, and every second year thereafter, elect one of their number as president of the board for a two-year term.)) At 12:00 o'clock noon on January 8, 1982, the term of office of the president of the board of supervisors shall expire and said office shall be assumed by the member who received the highest number of votes at the November 4, 1980 supervisorial election. Thereafter, at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1983, and every second year thereafter, the member receiving the highest number of votes at the last preceding supervisorial election shall assume the office of president of the board. When a vacancy occurs in the office of the president of the board, the supervisors shall elect one of their members as president for the unexpired portion of the term. The president shall preside at all meetings, shall appoint all standing and special committees of the board and shall have such other powers and duties as the supervisors may provide.
PROPOSITION M
Declaration of Policy: Shall the City and County of San Francisco, during the fiscal year of 1982-1983, acquire a fingerprint computer for use by San Francisco Law Enforcement personnel?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco law enforcement agencies do not have a computer to identify fingerprints.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M directs the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the 1982-1983 fiscal year for use by the City's law enforcement personnel.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to be directed to acquire a fingerprint computer during the fiscal year 1982-1983.

Controller's Statement on "M"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

"Should the initiative Declaration of Policy be adopted and implemented, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $2,200,000 to $3,600,000 depending on the specific computer system acquired.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
Fingerprint Computer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAVE THE CITY MONEY. MAKE THE CITY SAFER. VOTE YES ON M.

If a criminal leaves a single fingerprint at the scene of a crime, it should be like signing his name. Police should be able to identify him immediately. But San Francisco Police can’t do it because they don’t have the tool for it. With a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, our police could identify a print left at a crime scene in 7 to 10 minutes.

Currently, our police use a manual fingerprint identification system developed in 1907. It simply doesn’t work in 1982. There is too much crime. The police won’t even take fingerprints now at most crime scenes because there is no effective way to identify the criminal through them without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER.

San Francisco has approximately 70,000 major crimes in one year. Without a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, many murderers, rapists, burglars and other criminals — who could be identified through their fingerprints and arrested — remain free, instead, to attack again and again.

According to the Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors, a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER will save the City budget approximately $300,000 every year. And it will free police personnel to fight crime in other ways.

It is important that you tell city government that you want a safer city — and you want our police to have every modern tool.

Say you want a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER. Say you don’t just want to hear that there is money set aside for its purchase someday — you want it bought right now. There is a three year statute of limitations on virtually every crime but murder. That means that every day our police don’t have a FINGERPRINT COMPUTER, there are many criminals who are getting away with their crimes even though there is a way to identify them.

SAVE YOUR PROPERTY. SAVE YOUR NECK. SAVE OUR CITY. VOTE YES ON M.

Submitted by: Supervisor Wendy Nelder

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Even though the Mayor says she has initiated an appropriation to buy fingerprint computers, approval of this policy declaration is needed to prevent a reneging. The Police Chief has stated it will still take about 18 months to obtain a police computer. A lot of things could happen in 18 months to prevent such acquisition and operation. The adoption of this policy declaration, initiated by Wendy Nelder and supported by thousands of San Franciscans, will put backbone into the professed intent of City officials to give police an indispensable crime-fighting tool.

VOTE YES ON M

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

Ignoring other major crimes, just reducing burglary losses will quickly pay for this fingerprint computer many times over. Let’s give the police the ultra-modern “tools” they need to promptly remove career criminals from our streets! Vote YES!

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., President

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
P.G. & E. Rates

PROPOSITION N
Declaration of Policy: Shall the people of San Francisco oppose recent Pacific Gas and Electric rate increases and urge the State Public Utilities Commission to roll back rates to December 1, 1981 and call for other remedial actions?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) must file an application with the State Public Utilities Commission (PUC) to request a rate increase. The PUC holds public hearings on the application. At the public hearings, both the PG&E and the public can be heard. After the evidence is heard, the PUC decides if the rates should be increased.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition N is a declaration of policy that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable. This proposition urges the State PUC to do the following:
1. Return PG&E rates to what they were on December 1, 1981, while a public investigation of fuel costs is being made;
2. Base future PG&E rate increases on the purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to conservation and co-generation;
3. Hold PG&E, rather than its customers, responsible for the financial consequences of management errors.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you are declaring that PG&E rates are unacceptable and unaffordable. You are urging the State PUC to control PG&E rates as stated in the proposal above.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want this declaration of policy on PG&E rates.

Controller's Statement on "N"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition N:

"Should the policy statement be approved, it would neither increase nor decrease the cost of government. However, a loss of revenue to the City and County of San Francisco could result from decreased utility users taxes levied on total PG&E billing in an amount indeterminable at this time."

How Prop N Got On The Ballot

Proposition N was placed on the ballot by a City Charter provision which allows four or more individual members of the Board of Supervisors to place a Declaration of Policy on the ballot.

On March 22 the Registrar received a request from 5 supervisors asking that the policy question of opposing recent PG&E rate increases be placed on the ballot. The request was signed by Supervisors Harry Britt, Nancy Walker, Willie Kennedy, Carol Ruth Silver, and Doris M. Ward.
P.G. & E. Rates

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION N

The PUC has granted PG&E raises beyond our ability to pay. This policy statement will let the PUC and PG&E know that we don't want to pay for PG&E's bad management. PG&E must be responsible not only to their stockholders but to the public they serve.

Supervisor Harry Britt
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION N

Proposition N to roll back electric rates to 1981 levels is designed only to fool us.

Why not also roll back the cost of food, clothing, housing, medical care, transportation, the Muni, the sewer programs and all of the rest of the things that go into the cost of living?

If the sponsors of Proposition N want to be consistent, everything should be rolled back to 1981 levels.

But let's be sensible.

Take a look at the facts.

Seventy-six days of public hearings by the California Public Utilities Commission disclosed that over the past 10 years electric rates in San Francisco have risen primarily because the prices PGandE has had to pay for oil and gas have increased 1,310%!

Fuel bills account for 70% of your electric bill and the cost of that fuel cannot profit PGandE a penny under CPUC rules.

Proposition N could cripple electric service.

It would have a deadening impact on the Bay Area economy.

Proposition N would result in reduced employment opportunities at a time of recession.

PGandE has no control over fuel prices which means that only the wages of working people can be cut and in the past year the company has already reduced its work force by 1,000 employees.

A rate stabilization plan has been proposed by PGandE to the California Public Utilities Commission which would decrease residential electric rates to December, 1981 levels and hold them there for two years.

That is a realistic plan. It will work for San Francisco electric ratepayers.

Prop. N works against you.

Check the facts.

Vote NO on N.

Marguerite A. Warren, Taxpayer

Endorsed by:

Lawrence N. Foss, Sr. Assistant Business Mgr, Local Union No. 1245, IBEW
John N. Jacobs, Executive Director, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Herbert Suvaco, Secretary-treasurer, Teamsters, Warehouse & Misc., Union #860

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION N

The people of San Francisco find that present PG&E rates and proposed increases are unacceptable and unaffordable and hereby urge the California PUC to: Roll back rates to December 1, 1981 levels pending full public investigation of PG&E fuel costs; and condition future increases on PG&E's purchase of fuels at the lowest available rates and on a serious commitment by PG&E to equitable conservation and co-generation programs; and hold PG&E, rather than its customers, accountable for the financial consequences of management error. (end)
(Proposition A, Continued from pg. 28)
not paid prior to June 30 of the fiscal year during which the same are issued shall, nevertheless, be paid out of moneys received from the taxes of the said fiscal year, irrespective of the date of the receipt thereof, it being the intent and purpose of this section to provide for the payment of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued under authority of this section out of the taxes levied for the fiscal year during which said notes or other evidences of indebtedness are issued irrespective of the actual date of the collection of said taxes.)

(The board of supervisors shall have full power and authority to provide for the form of all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued by authority of this section, as well as to fix the time and place for the payment of both the principal amount of said notes or other evidences of indebtedness and the interest to become due thereon; provided that all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the first half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than December 31 of said year; and all notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued for money borrowed during the second half of any fiscal year shall be payable not later than May 15 of such year, it being the intent and purpose of this section that the borrowing of money under authority hereof shall be solely for the purpose of anticipating receipt of income. The mayor, in preparing the consolidated budget estimate as provided by this charter, shall include herein a separate amount sufficient to meet the interest to be paid on any moneys borrowed under authority of this section.)

The board of supervisors shall have the power to borrow money by the issuance of tax anticipation notes, temporary notes, commercial paper, or any other short-term debt instruments in the manner provided by the statutes of the State of California or pursuant to ordinance of the board of supervisors. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

9.103 Municipal Elections
On Tuesday after the first Monday in November in 1931 and every second year thereafter, there shall be held in the city and county an election to be known as the general municipal election, at which the electors of the city and county shall choose such officers or qualify such candidates as are required by this charter to be elected or qualified at that time.

In the event that a runoff election is required to be held pursuant to the provisions of sections 9.100-1 or 9.100-2 of this charter, on the second Tuesday in December in each year in which such a runoff election is required to be held as aforesaid, there shall be held an election to be known as the municipal runoff election at which the electors of the city and county shall elect such officers as are required by this charter to be elected at that time. Only those officers for which a runoff election is required to be held shall be voted on at any such municipal runoff election, and no other office or measure shall be voted on at said election.

Special municipal elections shall be called by the registrar when required by this chapter on the filing of appropriate initiative, referendum or recall petitions, as provided by this charter, and may be called by the supervisors for bond issues, declarations of policy, or for the voting on candidates for city and county offices not subject to elections at general municipal elections or municipal runoff elections.

The board of supervisors may, by resolution, direct the registrar to conduct by mail any general, runoff or special municipal election. Said resolution must be adopted no later than the 85th day before the date set for the election. The registrar shall conduct the election by mail when so directed. Within thirty (30) days from the date this amendment takes effect, the board shall adopt, by ordinance, procedures for the conduct of municipal elections by mail.

All provisions of the general laws of this state, including penal laws, respecting the registration of voters, initiative, referendum and recall petitions, elections, canvass of returns and all matters pertinent to any and all of these, shall be applicable to the city and county except as otherwise provided by this charter or by ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors as authorized by this charter relative to any rights, powers or duties of the city and county or its officers. When not prohibited by general law, the supervisors by ordinance may provide that the publication of precincts and polling places shall be by posting only. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION C

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((Double parentheses)).

8.423 Revision of Schedules and Compensation.
In January of each year, at a public hearing, the health service board shall review and determine the adequacy of medical care provided for members of the system and the adequacy of fee schedules and the compensation paid for all services rendered and it may make such revisions therein as it deems equitable but such revisions shall not become effective until ap-proved by ordinance of the board of supervisors adopted by three-fourths of its members.

Commencing in 1973, the health service board shall, prior to the second Monday in January in each year, conduct a survey of the 10 counties in the State of California, other than the City and County of San Francisco, having the largest populations to determine the average contribution made by each such county toward the providing of health care plans, (exclusive of dental or optical care) including dental care, for each employee of such county. In accordance with
(Proposition C, Continued)
said survey, the health service board shall determine the average contribution made with respect to each employee by said 10 counties toward the health care plans provided for their employees and on or before the second Monday in January of each year, the health service board shall certify to the board of supervisors the amount of such average contribution. For the purposes of section 8.428, the amount of such average contribution shall be "the average contribution.'

The health service board shall have the responsibility to obtain and disseminate information to its members with regard to plan benefits and costs thereof. All expenses in connection with obtaining and disseminating said information and the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including travel and transportation costs, shall be borne by the system from reserves in the health service fund but only upon adoption of a resolution by the health service board approving such expenses.

8.428 Health Service System Fund.

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as herebefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents, retired persons' dependents, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors((3)), and any employee whose compensation provides for a dental benefit from any source other than the health service system.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973. The amendments of section 8.423 and 8.428 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982 two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION D

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons; and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and
County Employees' Retirement System ((.)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The city and county, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purposes, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, that for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the community college district shall be charged against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on June 8, 1982, shall be effective July 1, 1983.

If in the election of June 8, 1982, two or more propositions amending section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (end)
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

NOTE: Additions are in bold face type; all sections are entirely additional.

8.519 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years.

Any allowance which had been payable to the surviving spouse of a member but which heretofore had been terminated by reason of the remarriage of said surviv-

ing spouse shall be recomputed to include all increases that have accrued since said termination and the recomputed allowance shall be payable to said surviving spouse, provided said remarriage, or the first of said remarriages if more than one, occurred on or after said surviving spouse attained the age of 60 years.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system.

This section does not give any person retired under any provisions of this charter, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION F

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

8.510 Actuarial Tables, Rates and Valuations

The morality, service and other tables and the rates of contributions for members as recommended by the actuary and the valuations determined by him and approved by the retirement board shall be conclusive and final, and the retirement system shall be based thereon. The total amount, as determined by the actuary and approved by the board, of the contributions required during any fiscal year of the city and county under the retirement system shall be paid into the retirement system by the city and county during such year. Liabilities accruing under the retirement system because of service rendered to the city and county by persons prior to the date their respective classes become eligible for membership in the system, and administrative costs under the system, shall be met by contributions to the retirement system by the city and county, in addition to any amounts contributed to meet liabilities accruing because of service rendered by such persons after becoming members of the system, provided that such prior service liabilities may be met by annual appropriations instead of by one appropriation for the total amount of liabilities; and provided further, that such appropriation for any one year shall not be less than the amount disbursed during that year on account of prior service. All expenses in connection with the investment of such fund or funds as may be established, including but not limited

to travel and transportation costs, investment seminar expenses, postage, insurance, telephone, and subscriptions to investment publications, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.509(b), (5) said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made as determined by the retirement board; provided, however, that said actuarial valuation shall be made not less than once every two years. All expenses in connection with said actuarial valuation and said investigation into the experience under the system; all expenses incurred by financial audits and accounting systems and procedures; and, all expenses of administration of plan benefits, including legal expenses thereof, shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county.

Contributions to the retirement system required of the city and county shall be charged by the controller against the general fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund under which the service was rendered, on account of which the contribution is required; provided that contributions required on account of service rendered by any person prior to becoming a member of the system, under a temporary fund, such as bond or county roads funds, or a fund then no longer existing, may be charged against the general fund, and provided further, that any contributions required on account of persons receiving benefits under subdivision (c) of section 8.507, shall be charged against the general fund. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

3.680 Board Composition

The health service board shall consist of (seven) nine members as follows: ((the chairman of the finance committee)) a member of the board of supervisors appointed by the board of supervisors for a two year term; the city attorney; ((two)) three members appointed by the mayor, one of whom shall be a re-

expiring on May 15 of each year). The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in 1984 and 1986 (each of the following years) and every five years thereafter; ((1959, 1961 and 1963)); the respective terms of two of the elective members shall expire on May 15, 1988 and every five years thereafter. The term of one of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire on May 15 in (each of the following years) 1985 and every five years thereafter; ((1960 and 1962)) the respective terms of two of the members appointed by the mayor shall

60
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold-face type**; deletions are indicated by **(double parentheses)**.

3.670 Board Composition

The retirement system shall be managed by a retirement board, which is hereby created, and which shall be the successor and have the powers and the duties of the Board of Administration, the Board of Trustees of the Police Relief and Pension Fund, and the Board of Fire Pension Fund Commissioners. The retirement board shall consist of ((the president)) a member of the board of supervisors ((),) appointed by the board of supervisors for two year terms, (((three members)) four members to be appointed by the mayor, (and)) three members elected from the active members from among their number and one member elected by the retired members of the retirement system from among their number. ((who shall not include retired persons of the retirement system.)) The members appointed by the mayor shall (either each hold a degree of doctor of medicine, or shall be experienced in life insurance, actuarial science, employee pension planning, or investment portfolio management, and shall be appointed by the mayor from among four persons whose names shall have been submitted to the mayor for each such appointment by a committee consisting of two members each of the San Francisco Medical Society, Bar Association of San Francisco, San Francisco Real Estate Board and the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; provided, however, that there shall not be, at any one time, more than one appointed member who holds a degree of doctor of medicine or is from the same qualifying field of expertise. The term of office of the eight members, other than the president) member of the board of supervisors, shall be five years, and the terms presently in effect for appointed and elected members shall continue to apply ((.)); provided, however, that the term of office of the elected members shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1985, 1986, and 1987. The term of office of the members appointed by the mayor shall expire in February in each of the following years and every five years thereafter: 1983, 1984, 1985 and 1988. Whenever a term of office shall expire or whenever a vacancy shall occur during a term of office of any member appointed by the mayor, the term of office or unexpired portion of the vacated term of office shall be filled by appointment by the mayor no later than sixty days following the expiration of a term of office or of a vacancy occurring during a term of office. However, should the affirmation committee not submit to the mayor the required name or names within 30 days of any vacancy, the mayor may fill said vacancy with an individual who meets the qualifications specified above without committee recommendation. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected active member the vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of section 16.551 of the administrative code of the city and county of San Francisco. Whenever a vacancy shall occur involving the term of an elected retired member, the election of a retired member shall be conducted by the registrar of voters in accordance with provisions set forth by ordinance of the board of supervisors and said elected retired member shall take office in February 1983 and every five years thereafter. All expenses incurred in the implementation of this section shall be paid from the accumulated contributions of the city and county. The members of the retirement board shall serve without compensation. ((Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter the retirement board shall appoint a secretary general manager). Notwithstanding the provisions of this amendment, the board positions created herein shall be filled concurrently in February 1983. (end)
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1. PRINTED NAME
LETRAS DE IMPRENTA Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.

2. ELECTION DATE  JUNE 8, 1982
I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIAME LA BALOTA A:

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

5. Date

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrante en San Francisco

6. □ I prefer election materials in English
□ Prefiero materiales electorales en español
□ 我欲索取中文選舉資料

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.
I moved on ___________________19________
My residence address is __________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.
Me cambié el ________________ de 19________
Mi dirección es __________________________

NOTA: Un votante que se cambia dentro de 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambia antes de los 29 días anteriores a la elección y que no se registra antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1982,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO
DE LA TARDE, MARTES 1, JUNTO
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

印刷一份缺席選票給本人，以参加上述選舉。

Por la presente solicito una balota de Votante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

如你已遷居，現所居住地不是你在註冊選舉簿上之住址，請填寫此表格。

已在一九__年__月__日遷居

我現在的住址是：_________________________

注意：選民在此次選舉前二十九日內遷居者，可索取一份缺席選票。選民在此次選舉前遷居超過二十九日，而在選舉選舉日期截止日尚未重新註冊者，沒有資格選舉。

申請缺席選票必須在選舉日前七日之前，即六月一日星期二下午五時前於選民註冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。
VOTER SELECTION COUPON

Applyacion para papeleta de votante ausente aparece en la pagina 63
Application for absentee ballot appears on page 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Defender
Judge, Municipal Court 21
Judge, Superior Court 22
Assemblyman/Senator
US Representative
US Senator
Board of Education
Secretary of State
Governor

Address
558-4417
558-3061

San Francisco, CA 94102-4691
155 City Hall
Registrar of Voters
Jay Patterson