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FOR MAYOR
JOSEPH L. ALIOTO

My name is Joseph L. Alioto.
My residence address is at No. 34 Presidio Terrace, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Mayor of San Francisco.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Many large Ameri-
can cities are in severe trouble—crime-ridden, race-torn, strike-
plagued, littered, broke, festering, dying. Not San Francisco. With
your help and hard work, we have had safer streets, taxes under
control, racial and labor harmony, renewed neighborhoods, more
jobs, better housing, gains for our aged and youth, and solid eco-
logical progress on freeways, the Bay, high-rises and open space.
As your Mayor, I need your support in helping our City win the
urban crisis that is now killing other cities and in proving again
that San Francisco still knows how.
Ballot designation: Mayor of San Francisco.
Signature of Candidate: JOSEPH L. ALIOTO.

The sponsors for Joseph L. Alioto are:
Angelina G. Alioto, 34 Presidio Terr., Homemaker
Ann W. Alanson, 1275 Greenwich St., Housewife
Rev. George L. Bedford, 271 Dalewood Way, Minister
Philip S. Boone, 540 El Camino Del Mar, Senior Vice President-Advertising
Peter Boudoures, 1200 California St., President Olympic Federal Savings
Patrick M. Breen, 1926 48th Ave., President Health Service Board
Harry Bridges, 35 Kruuquist Ct., Trade Union Official
Robert C. Buckley, 260 Day St., Law Student
William H. Chester, 432 Gold Mine Dr., Labor Union Official, I.L.W.U.
William K. Cobletz, 10 Fifth Ave., Attorney
Matthew F. Connolly, 399 Fremont St., Catholic Priest
Joseph J. Diviny, 125 Cambon Dr., Int'l. V.P. Teamsters Union
Abel Gonzalez, 940 Treat Ave., Field Representative Labor Union 261
John F. Henning, 185 Westwood Dr., Union Labor Official
Eric Hoffer, 1547 Clay St., Retired Longshoreman
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes Ave., Architect
Vernon Kaufman, 25 Presidio Terr., Merchant
Francis V. Keesling Jr., 930 Chestnut St., Insurance Executive
Frances M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
William F. Murray, 1723 27th Ave., Retired Chief, San Francisco Fire Dept.
Joseph C. Oregno, 800 Faxon Ave., Vice President-Geary Ford Inc.
Leola Puccinelli, 3040 23rd Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., President Retired Employees C & C of S.F.
George R. Reilly, 2774 34th Ave., Member State Board of Equalization
Elmer E. Robinson, 1200 California St. Apt. 27B, Judge of Superior Court,
Retired
James J. Rudden, 148 Chenery St., Corporation Executive
James A. Silva, 88 Country Club Dr., Uphl. Shop Owner
Benjamin H. Swig, 950 Mason St., Hotel Operator
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746 32nd Ave., Public Relations
Elouise Westbrook, 522 Navy Rd., Community Liaison
My name is John Gardner Brent.
My residence address is at No. 1120 Kearny Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Actor.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have been a professional improvisational actor with The Committee in San Francisco for seven years. I have no partisan political affiliations. I will have no legal commitments except to the role of mayor. My experience appearing before audiences has prepared me to improvise successfully and will stand me in good stead to meet the largely ceremonial requirements of this office. I will use every means necessary to defend San Francisco from the twin evils of Manhattenizing (skyscrapers, street crime, smog) and Los Anglicizing (freeways, traffic casualties, smog). I am your non-partisan, non-indicted candidate for mayor.
Ballot designation: Actor.
Signature of Candidate: JOHN GARDNER BRENT.

The sponsors for John Gardner Brent are:
Steve william Darryl Kinne, 1403 Kearny St., Asst. Stagemanager
Committee Theatre
Reuben W. Parker, 1403 Kearny St., Unemployed
William B. Loughborough, 2477 Washington St., Theater Manager
Bill Lawrence Remper, 1854 Filbert St., Bar Manager
Lisa Taylor, 1854 Filbert St., Waitress at Committee Cabaret
Nan Hohenstein, 2247A Turk St., Press Counsel
Joe Carl Parsons, 757 Waller St., Stagehand
Jack Travis, 450A Vallejo St., Student
Christine Joy, 450A Vallejo St., Box Office Manager
Wendy Wood, 1815 Powell St. #3, Waitress
Robert A. Brown, 16 Laidley, Gen’l Mgr. On Broadway Theatre
Andrew H. D’Anneo, 212 Spruce St., Lawyer
Claire Harrison, 1569 Masonic Ave., Pres. Claire Harrison Associate, Inc.
Dolores Ann Badami, 1120 Kearny St., Housewife
Linda A. Shalaeff, 622 Broadway, Bookkeeper
Faiga F. Duncan, 58 Dolores Terrace, Management Assistant
Charles G. Salazar, 2475 Washington St., Store Owner
Sylvain Tour, 2475 Washington St., Musician
Karil Daniels, 1221 Union St. #2, Actress
Gary R. Moore, 45-B Twin Peaks Blvd., Actor
My name is Jeffrey R. Chaskin.
My residence address is at No. 525 33rd Ave., San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Student.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Inasmuch as I am inexperienced at political office, I must rely on my honest intention to do the best job possible in coordinating all resources and brain-power made available to me as mayor. I will fill this office with integrity, honesty, and most of all my great love for San Francisco and the people who reside therein.
Ballot designation:
Signature of Candidate: JEFFREY R. CHASKIN.

The sponsors for Jeffrey R. Chaskin are:
Charles Clay, 668 Elizabeth St., Organizer
Gordon J. Lundberg, 642 Alvarado St., Unemployed
Pam Kilmartin, 48 Winston Dr., Student
Joan S. Dillon, 1460 Webster St. #4, Librarian
Thomas N. Ryan, 1587 40th Ave., Librarian-Page
Louise Santoro, 1261 41st Ave., Librarian
Michael Cook, 2817 19th St., Artist
Julie A. Costanzo, 902 Noe St., Student-Page
Richard David Fahnner, 301 Hoffman Ave., Antique Dealer
Cheryl Fahnner, 301 Hoffman Ave., Housewife & Mother
Susan C. Ecklon, 11 Thor Ave., File Clerk
Victoria Ryan, 1527 40th Ave., Student
Phillip Galgiani, 2626 Larkin St., Artist
Susan Migdoll, 1741 11th Ave., Secretary
Richard McGhee, 74 6th St., Warehouseman
Judith C. Aldridge, 458 Union St., Student
Donnell N. Masella, 903 So. Van Ness Ave., Tax Consultant
Van H. Furlough, 559 Orizaba Ave., Deputy Sheriff
Steven T. Robertson, 4155 Army St. #10, Political Worker
Marjorie G. Lemlow, 184 25th Ave., Businesswoman, Housewife
George Ranjo, 27 Excelsior Ave., Library Assistant
William W. Meyers, 39A McCoppin St., Student
Janice Moore, 2215A Clement St., Sr. Stenographer
Jane Corbett, 520 Taylor St., Office Worker
John J. Corbett, 520 Taylor St. #402, Retired
Michael Doyle, 731 Chestnut St., Educational Consultant
FOR MAYOR
STANLEY LEE COTTON

My name is Stanley Lee Cotton.
My residence address is at No. 2161 Hayes Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Mayor Candidate.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: A man.
Ballot designation: Carpenter.
Signature of Candidate: STANLEY LEE COTTON.

The sponsors for Stanley Lee Cotton are:
Jeanie E. Cotton, 2161 Hayes St., Housewife
Clinton Reilly, 546 Fillmore St., Businessman
Michael Kim Wong, 138 Trenton St., Student
Lori Head, 834 Arkansas St., Apt. 4, Student
Thomas E. Walsh, 1351 Masonic Ave., Artist
Ira M. Duden, 509 18th Ave., Student
Thomas L. Jerrels, 436 10th Ave., Landscape Laborer
Robert E. Kahn, 525 10th Ave., Student
Anna S. Gewing, 1666 35th Ave., Housewife & Student
Noah W. Griffin, 839 41st Ave., Retired
John P. McCloskey, 115 1/2 Andover St., Student
H. Brown Miller, 501 Foerster St., Teacher
Marguerite Donaldson, 480 Hazelwood Ave., Student
Sharon L. Friedrich, 335 Hill St., Clerk-typist
Leon W. Tsakousis, 458 Mangels Ave., Retail Clerk
Kevin Gallagher, 1342 Masonic Ave., Student
Dennis H. Fong, 782 Myra Way, Student
John M. Bird, 25 Northwood Dr., Student CCSF
Robert Earl Williams, 609 Sawyer St., Kitchen Helper
Cecelia Madrid, 200 Van Ness Ave., #101, Student
Barbara Gatlin, 827 14th St., Unemployed
Raymond C. Drummond, 1786 9th Ave., Personnel Aide
Georgina Susan Knight, 120 Albion St., Student
Christopher T. Dunworth, 120 Albion St., Student
Richard V. Gordon, 734 Bush St., Minister of Religion
Michael J. McClure, 1541 California St., Motorman
Laurence Faulks, 25 Camwo Way, Deputy Registrar
Donnie R. Perkins, 321 Fulton St., Youth Counselor
Prudence Alasia, 2575 Greenwich St., Housewife
FOR MAYOR
JOHN C. DIAMANTE

My name is John C. Diamante.
My residence address is at No. 83 Divisadero Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Citizen.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: The town is dis-
appearing. Time has run out on discrimination, crime, inequity and
unjust taxation. City Hall’s corruption and inaction stifle democ-
ropy, frustrate community initiative, destroy the pleasures of city
life and jeopardize earth’s resources. Our neighborhoods want the
means to develop the arts, useful jobs, quality housing, health care,
a clean, green environment and exciting education. I see the city
transformed by alternatives to the automobile, responsible systems
for energy generation and waste reclamation, and peaceful trade
between West and East. I pledge four creative years of honest
enterprising public service to all the peoples of our San Francisco.
Ballot designation: Citizen.
Signature of Candidate: JOHN C. DIAMANTE.

The sponsors for John C. Diamante are:
William R. Wiley, 1501 Masonic Ave., Banker
Patricia Mostouoy, 465 Roosevelt Way, Secretary
Robert A. Lewis, 3752 16th St., Laborer-Musician
Kathleen E. Foote, 83 Divisadero St., Legal Assistant
David S. Austin, 553 Duboce Ave, Apt. 8, Musician
Linda Shreck, 83 Divisadero St., Film Editor
Frances J. Peavey, 80 Pierce St., Teacher
Harold A. Ashford, 364 Page St., #9, Attorney
Annie L. Burr, 364 Page St., U. S. Postal Clerk
Carlos K. Caruajal, 1349 Masonic Ave., Choreographer
Joseph Richmond, 2039 Broderick St., Student
Remigio E. Valido, 2932 Baker St., Oceanographer
Harold McDermid, 277 Stratford Dr., Attorney
Charles W. Scott Hope, 249 Niagara Ave., Educator
Gil Bailie, 100 Varennes St. Apt. 5, Director, S.F. Ecology Center
Charles Kyriakos J. Papantes, 1218 Montgomery St., Importer
Michael Kim Wong, 138 Trenton St., Student
James Stuart Hall, 719 Rhode island St., Photographer
Carolyn Cavallero, 2131 Taylor St., Model, Dancer
Nancy Strohl, 2517 Van Ness Ave., Research Analyst
Larry R. Gels, 5 Northview Ct., Accountant
Charles F. Swisher, 5 North View, Acoustical Consultant
Patricia Lamerdin, 1925 Leavenworth St., Artist
John W. B. Thompson Jr., 949B Guerrero St., Teacher
Robert E. Mooney, 37 Mizpah St., Student
Fielding E. Cooley, 530 Congo St., Program Director S. F. Ecology Center
Kathleen M. Murphy, 1405 Seventh Ave., Housewife
Harvey A. Brody, 130 18th Ave., Dentist
John W. Murphy, 1405 7th Ave., Translator
Michael T. Lynch, 925 Maple St., Stockbroker
My name is Harold Dobbs.  
My residence address is at No. 1000 Mason St., San Francisco.  
My business or occupation is Lawyer-Businessman.  
My qualifications for said office are as follows: For eight years San Francisco has gone adrift without effective leadership. We can't afford the luxury of another four year mistake. To avoid the fate befalling Eastern cities, we must put our City on the right, progressive course.

Have you had enough?  
Enough deception, enough empty promises, enough skyrocketing taxes and crime, enough Muniserable railway service, enough rampant highrise development?

San Francisco needs leadership—glib oratory is not enough.  
I owe my City much. I make one promise—full time leadership as your Mayor.

I need your help. I ask for your vote.  
After all, have you had enough?

Ballot designation: Lawyer-Businessman.  
Signature of Candidate: HAROLD DOBBS.

The sponsors for Harold Dobbs are:
Annette Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Wife and Mother  
Harry J. Aleo, 1285 Monterey Blvd., Realtor  
Dr. Peter T. Angel, 1867 15th Ave., Retired Dentist  
John Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Supervisor, City and County S.F.  
B. John Bugatto, 3248 Baker St., Attorney at Law  
Dr. Ramiro Y. Cruz, 231 Ellis St., Dentist  
Philip Dindia, 345 Banks St., Retired Labor Representative  
John Alden Doty, 150 15th Ave., Lawyer  
Michael A. Durkin, 2081 18th Ave., Savings and Loan Executive  
J. T. Estes Jr., 696 12th Ave., Publisher-The Mabuhay Republic  
Geo. B. Gillin, 265 Stratford Dr., Public Relations  
John J. Goodwin, Jr., 2551 16th Ave., President-Gibraltar Savings and Loan  
Joseph M. Hannan, 68 1/2 Hancock St., Fl'n'l. Secty Local #732 I.A. of M.&A.  
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Businessman  
Jack S. Kusaba, 6 Chicago Way, Executive  
Dert W. Levit, 405 Davis Court, Lawyer  
Felipe Marquez, 45 Upper Terrace, Dentist, D.D.S.  
George Medina, 2974 28th St., Advertising Salesman  
William Moskowitz, 1901 California St., Retired  
Frank J. Pagliaro, Jr., 2171 Sacramento St., Attorney at Law  
Richard G. Raffetto, 550 Myra Way, Realtor  
John M. (Jack) Riordan, 66 Vasquez Ave., Attorney at Law  
Charles D. Rush, 26 Inverness Dr., Insurance  
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner, Andre's TV  
Clarence R. Stern, 35 Roselyn Terrace, Inheritance Tax Referee  
John B. Sullivan, 23 Magellan St., Attorney  
Henry S. Tom, 2732 35th Ave., Executive Director-YMCA  
Addie N. Wallace, 809 Grafton Ave., Supervisor  
John J. Webb, 187 Lakeshore Dr., Security Analyst  
Thomas W. S. Wu, 598 38th Ave., Doctor of Dental Surgery
My name is Dianne Feinstein.
My residence address is at No. 2030 Lyon Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is President, San Francisco Board of Supervisors.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I pledge total dedication and truthfulness in dealing with problems of jobs, crime, housing, race relations, environment, transportation and taxes. As President, Board of Supervisors, and member of the Boards of Directors of the California County Supervisors Association and Bay Area Air Pollution Control District, I have worked to achieve better use of police, summer jobs and ongoing apprenticeship program for minority youth, noise abatement legislation and much more. As Mayor, I will provide a new spirit of leadership, bringing us all together in a united drive to improve the residential, business and recreational quality of life in San Francisco.
Ballot designation: President, Board of Supervisors.
Signature of Candidate: DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

The sponsors for Dianne Feinstein are:
Bertram Feinstein, M.D., 2030 Lyon St., Neurosurgeon
Douglas R. Baer, 76 Molino Drive, Presbyterian Minister
Alan D. Becker, 3699 Washington St., Merchant
John H. Bickel, 3733 Sacramento St., Lawyer
William M. Brinton, 2434 Broadway, Attorney
George Brown, 66 Cleary Ct. #308, Employment
T. Robert Burke, 130 Palm Ave. #4, Attorney
Jun Ke Choy, 810 45th Ave., Savings & Loan Ass’n.
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 698 Los Palmos Dr., Physician
Frederick A. Goerner, 24 Presidio Terr., Author-Broadcaster
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820 47th Ave., Industrial Consultant
Anne S. Howden, 191 Upper Terr., Financial Secretary
Jackson Kee Hu, 619 Clay St., Real Appraiser
E. Diane Hunter, 604 48th Ave., Statistician
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Civic Leader
Nancy Knickerbocker, 2600 Union St., Housewife
Melvin D. Lee, 662 21st Ave., Engineer
Sally Lilienthal, 2960 Vallejo St., Sculptor
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Steel Worker & Pres. Shafter Ave.
Community Club
William J. Middleon, 1621 York St., Urban Planner
Russell R. Miller, 41 Walnut St., Businessman
Michael L. Ohleyer, 155 14th Ave., Lawyer
Esther Pike, 3027 Webster St., Museum Administrator
William L. Porter, 1020 Union St., Attorney at Law
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
Leon Schlosser, 3631 Jackson St., Television Executive
Kazue Togasaki, M.D., 1848 Buchanan St., Physician & Surgeon
Boris Veltkogin, 1361 16th Ave., President Russian Center
Michael B. Willmar, 275 Liberty St. #6, Attorney
Mrs. Patsy Lou Wilsey, 900 Green St., P.H. #1, Housewife
My name is Scott Newhall.  
My residence address is at No. 1050 North Point Street, San Francisco.  
My business or occupation is Publisher-Business Executive.  
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a fourth generation San Franciscan. As Executive Editor or Editor of the Chronicle for almost 20 years, I was continually in contact with the city's politicians and the men who bankroll them. I am seeking election because I know that years of political patronage and cronyism have left the city chaotic and rebellious. I owe no political debt to anyone. San Francisco desperately needs to reestablish non-partisan democracy in City Hall where the voices of the people should be heeded. San Francisco cannot be restored overnight—it will take years of unselfish and dedicated work by everyone.  
Ballot designation: Publisher-Business Executive.  
Signature of Candidate: SCOTT NEWHALL.  

The sponsors for Scott Newhall are:  
Eva L. Young, 827 Corbett Ave., Beautician  
Ronald Steven Young, D.D.S., 827 Corbett Ave., Dentist  
Sybil B. Walsh, 1760 16th Ave., Housewife  
Christopher Springmann, 2619 Laguna St., Photographer  
Angelina Brown, 576 Second Ave., Housewife  
Charles Huy, 555 Post St., Public Relations and Advertising  
Matthew B. Weinberg, 2550 Leavenworth St., Attorney at Law  
Dominic A. Demartini, 150 London St., Retired Printer  
Anne Dublin, 2165 Larkin St., Antique Dealer  
Dorothy Johansen, 1963 Clay St., Physical Therapist  
Denise D. Turrell, 1333 Jones St., #410, Public Relations  
Frederick H. Davis, 640 Eddy St., Mechanic  
Frances Boomer, 147 17th Ave., Secretary  
Margaret B. Chicourrat, 1551 Sacramento St., Saleswoman  
Ruben R. Torres, 242 Turk St., Businessman  
Claire M. Scott, 999 Green St., Housewife  
Frances A. Neale, 38 Service Place, Office Manager  
Judith McBean Hunt, 281 Telegraph Hill Blvd.  
Richard G. Childress, Ship Balclutha, Pier 43, Ship's Manager  
Leroy Williams, 1010 Fell St. #5, Newspaper Reporter  
Nathan H. Howard, 1296 48th Ave., Upholsterer  
K. Ballan, 67 Inverness Dr., Deputy Clerk  
J. Scott Farley, 2231 Green St., Public Service-Businessman  
Bruce Hoffman, 255 Tingley St., Mathematician  
Thomas L. O'Brien, 830 Arguello Blvd., Real Estate Developer  
Everett L. Bowden, 1924 22nd St., Public Administrator  
William J. Kelly, 1555 Sacramento St., Clerk Messenger  
Dorris B. Kelly, 1555 Sacramento St., Secretary
My name is Fred Selinger.
My residence address is at No. 2545 Lyon Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Investment Executive.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I believe the people of San Francisco are looking for a new kind of political leadership. They are aware that the old politics which dominates the Mayor's office today is undermining our proper destiny of greatness, beauty and prosperity. Contrary to what we have been told, this city has the revenues and the manpower to make great strides toward fulfilling the needs of its residents. What we lack is the efficient, effective and imaginative leadership from the Mayor's office. That is the kind of leadership I will provide.

Ballot designation: Investment Executive - Environmentalist.
Signature of Candidate: FRED SELINGER.

The sponsors for Fred Selinger are:
Peggy G. Selinger, 2454 Lyon St., Housewife
Barbara J. Brady, 1649 9th Ave., Journalist, S.F. Chamber of Commerce
Linda Castro, 1837 Oak St., Clerk-Typist
Manuel Chaffo, 288 Lexington St., Social Service Technician
Jack L. Cregler, 1836 McAllister St., Office Worker
Lowell J. Dickson, 218 Castro St., Stockbroker
Marilyn Ann Dickson, 218 Castro St., Nurse
Rebecca Evans, 2332 Anza St., Receptionist
Frank D. Fredericks, 169 Lower Terrace, Social Worker
Neti Fredericks, 169 Lower Terrace, Housewife
Richard N. Goldman, 3700 Washington St., Insurance
Douglas Goodman, 3638 Lawton St., Salesman
John P. Greenagel, 2405 Octavia St., Chamber of Commerce Executive
Anita Guerra, 2550 Pacific Ave., Public Health Nurse
Joseph J. Kubancik, 2340 Fulton St., Law Student
Marshall H. Kuhn, 30 Seventh Ave., Manager, Irwin Memorial Blood Bank
Louis K. Loewenstein, 3858 Jackson St., Urban Planner
Jeff Masonek, 321 San Benito Way, Student
Daniel J. O'Connor, 753 Leavenworth St., Retail Manager
Jerry Sandy, 1647 35th Ave., Student
D. M. Schantz, 21 14th Ave., Commercial Artist
M. Scott Stewart, 2552 Hyde St., Chamber of Commerce Management
Judith F. Sutherland, 822 35th Ave., Sales Administrator
Theodore E. Walker, 625 Scott St., Bus Driver
Henry Yee, 77 Valparaiso St., Merchandise Manager
Patricia J. Yee, 77 Valparaiso St., Housewife
FOR MAYOR
J. TONY SERRA

My name is J. Tony Serra.
My residence address is at No. 112 Pfeiffer Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Lawyer.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: My qualification is my honest commitment to the actualization of converting San Francisco into a Renaissance City-State. I am pledged to implementing the drastic changes in Municipal government necessary in order to create a city without taxes, victimless crimes, or draft. Platypus for San Francisco means the re-distribution of wealth and power to the people.
Ballot designation: Lawyer.
Signature of Candidate: J. TONY SERRA.

The sponsors for J. Tony Serra are:
Linda Angell, 626 Baker St., Secretary
Carol Elizabeth Bagby, 1352 Grant Ave. #2, Writer-Photographer
Wendy Crooks Purdom, 67 Mullen Ave., Teacher
Richard J. Dominguez, 349 Lexington Ave., Jeweler
Mary Ann Dyess, 1815 Oak St., Artist
Joel Feher, 4249 25th St., Teacher
Wilda E. Ferguson, 1630 Page St., Mother
Anna V. Goodwin, 242 Turk St., Student
Delta Lori Harrison, 2360 Van Ness Ave. #2, Photographer
Melvin O. Henderson, 2814 25th St., Teacher
Dale B. Metcalf, 112 Pfeiffer St., Lawyer
David Michael Nagle, 4224A 26th St., House painter
Lee George Peraud, 1217-H Turk St., Unemployed
Jack R. Rains, 1030 Geary St., Unemployed
Elizabeth B. Ridaur, 4224a 26th St., Bottomless Dancer—Housewife
Paul V. Ridley, 4224a 26th St., Teacher
John F. Scully, 3251A Scott St., Painter
Donna Seid, 1450 Grant Ave., Jewelry Designer
Lee Shapiro, 896 14th St., Musician
John J. Wike, 4231 26th St., Photographer
Nettie Sue Wike, 4231 26th St., Housewife
FOR MAYOR

NATHAN WEINSTEIN

My name is Nathan Weinstein.
My residence address is at No. 128 Henry Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Housepainter.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a 46 year old housepainter and a member of the Painters Union for twenty-five years. After participating in the antiwar movement since its inception, I now serve on the Steering Committee of the Northern California Peace Action Coalition.

I feel that large segments of the City’s population, especially the poor and minority members, are not represented by the city government. Since the majority of people in San Francisco are working people I feel I could represent their interest effectively. I am a member of the Socialist Workers Party.
Ballot designation: Socialist Worker.
Signature of Candidate: NATHAN WEINSTEIN.

The sponsors for Nathan Weinstein are:
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Jane Sica, 412 Foerster St., Socialist
Richard L. Winger, 1655 Greenwich St., Claims Authorizer
Carole Seidman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
John L. Goebel Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St. Apt. 8, Socialist Worker
Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Mark R. Schneider, 1015 Masonic Ave. #11, Socialist
Jessica R. Star, 1015 Masonic Ave., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey L. Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unemployed
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 306A Sanchez St., Mail Clerk
Jeffrey A. Berchenko, 62A Sanchez St., Socialist Worker
Peggy Joan Bunn, 112 Turquoise Way, Unemployed
Duncan E. Gordon, 3806 18th St., Letter Carrier
Laura Dertz, 3864 18th St., Socialist Worker
Milton T. Chee, 3624 16th St., Socialist Worker
Lawrence Hyink III, 4077A 18th St., Postman
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
James K. Gotesky, 1405 Franklin St. #305, Unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee) organizer
Barbara B. Deur, 350 Noe St. #6, Librarian
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Miss Bonnie Joy Bompart, 352 Sanchez St., Student
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Roland Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Housepainter
Thomas M. Harper, 1327 45th Ave., Apt. 1, Postal Clerk
Sheldon P. Colvin, 131 Lake St., Printer
FOR SUPERVISOR
JEFFREY A. BERCHENKO

My name is Jeffrey A. Berchenko. My residence address is at No. 62-A Sanchez Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Student. My qualifications for said office are as follows: Unemployment, housing, and racism are problems faced by every student in San Francisco, yet, not one student activist is on the board of Supervisors. If I am elected I intend to organize all the energy and talent of the San Francisco students to solve these problems. Youth of all races have worked against the war and for civil rights. They can work together to cure the ills of this city. I am a member of City College Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers Party. Ballot designation: Socialist Worker.

Signature of Candidate: JEFFREY A. BERCHENKO.

The sponsors for Jeffrey A. Berchenko are:

Carole Seidman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
Richard L. Winger, 1655 Greenwich St., Claims Authorizer
Jane Sica, 412 Foerster St., Socialist
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
James K. Gotesky, 1405 Franklin St. #306, Unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee) organizer
Barbara B. Deur, 350 Noe St. #6, Librarian
John L. Goebel Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St., Apt. #8, Socialist Worker
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Mark R. Schneider, 1015 Masonic Ave., #11, Socialist
Jessica R. Star, 1015 Masonic Ave., Socialist worker
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 366A Sanchez St., Mail Clerk
Jeffrey L. Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unemployed
Peggy Joan Bunn, 112 Turquoise Way, Unemployed
Duncan E. Gordon, 3868 18th St., Letter Carrier
Lawrence Hyink III, 4077A 18th St., Postman
Laura Dertz, 3864 18th St., Socialist Worker
Milton T. Chee, 3624 16th St., Socialist Worker
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Miss Bonnie Joy Bompart, 352 Sanchez St., Student
Roland Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Housepainter
Thomas M. Harper, 1327 45th Ave. Apt. 1, Postal Clerk
Sheldon P. Colvin, 131 Lake St., Printer
FOR SUPERVISOR
MILTON T. CHEE

My name is Milton T. Chee.
My residence address is at No. 3624 16th Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Muni Bus Driver.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a Muni Bus driver in San Francisco, and a member of the Transport Workers Union, Local 250A. I have been active in building the anti-war movement and Third World and labor participation in it since 1967. Only when blacks and browns and all oppressed minorities have complete control of their communities will they get equal opportunities with the rest of the population. I am a member of the Socialist Workers Party and correspondent for “The Militant.”
Ballot designation: Socialist Worker.
Signature of Candidate: MILTON T. CHEE.

The sponsors for Milton T. Chee are:
Carole Seldman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
Richard L. Winger, 1655 Greenwich St., Claims authorizer
Jane Sica, 412 Poerster St., Socialist
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
James K. Cotesky, 1405 Franklin St. #305, Unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee) organizer
Barbara B. Deur, 350 Noe St., #6, Librarian
John L. Goebel Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St., #8, Socialist Worker
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Mark R. Schneider, 1015 Masonic #11, Socialist
Jessica R. Star, 1015 Masonic Ave., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey A. Berchenko, 62A Sanchez St., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey L. Benacke, 384 Sanchez St., Unemployed
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 366A Sanchez St., Mail clerk
Peggy Joan Bunn, 112 Turquoise Way, Unemployed
Duncan E. Gordon, 3856 18th St., Letter Carrier
Laura Dertz, 3864 18th St., Socialist Worker
Lawrence Hyink III, 4077A 18th St., Postman
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Miss Bonnie Joy Bompart, 352 Sanchez St., Student
Roland Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Housepainter
Thomas M. Harper, 1327 45th Ave., Apt. 1, Postal Clerk
Sheldon P. Colvin, 181 Lake St., Printer
My name is Laura Dertz.
My residence address is at No. 3864 18th St., San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Socialist Worker.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have been active in building the Women's Liberation movement in this city, both on the campus and in the anti-war movement. Over 50% of this city's voters are women yet only two are on the Board of Supervisors. I feel that the city govt must take a leading part in ending discrimination against women. Equal wages and opportunities in both education and employment would be my main concern, if elected. A women's center, financed by the City of SF and run by the Women of SF should be our first task.
Ballot designation: Socialist Worker.
Signature of Candidate: LAURA DERTZ.

The sponsors for Laura Dertz are:
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
James K. Gotesky, 1408 Franklin St. #305, Unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee) organizer
Carole Seidman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
Richard L. Winger, 1055 Greenwich St., Claims authorizer
Jane Sica, 412 Forster St., Socialist
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Barbara B. Deur, 350 Noe St. #6, Librarian
Lawrence Hyink III, 4077A 18th St., Postman
Duncan E. Gordon, 3866 18th St., Letter Carrier
Jeffrey L. Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unemployed
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 366A Sanchez St., Mail Clerk
Milton T. Choc, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Nathan Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey A. Berchenko, 62A Sanchez Street, Socialist Worker
Mark R. Schneider, 1015 Masonic Ave. #11, Socialist
Jessica R. Star, 1015 Masonic Ave., Socialist Worker
John L. Goebel Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St., #8, Socialist Worker
Peggy Joan Bunn, 112 Turquoise Way, Unemployed
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Miss Ronnie Joy Bompart, 352 Sanchez St., Student
Thomas M. Harper, 1237 45th Ave. Apt. 1, Postal Clerk
Sheldon P. Colvin, 131 Lake St., Printer
For Supervisor
Donald Donaldson

My name is Donald Donaldson. My residence address is at No. 460 Hazelwood Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Businessman. My qualifications for said office are as follows: Having served in various official capacities many years in civic and conservation organizations, representing them at the State Legislature as well as the Board, I am competent, by experience, to represent San Franciscans in matters affecting the destiny of our beloved City. By the electorate giving me official status on the Board they will enable me to enact legislation against increased taxation, increased cost of government, and other matters of vital importance. I believe public officials should be servants of the people, not the people servants of public officials.

Ballot designation: Businessman.
Signature of Candidate: DONALD DONALDSON.

The sponsors for Donald Donaldson are:
Marguerite Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood Ave., Student
Rosemary Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood Ave., Teacher
George Cramer, 1830 Noriega St., Sales
Russell G. Davis, 165 Northpoint St., #219, Stockbroker
Marguerite M. Derby, 31 Riverton Dr., Retired
Charles Eierman, 465 Hazelwood Ave., Retired
Barbara P. Gaar, 440 Hazelwood Ave., Housewife
Fred M. Gaar, 440 Hazelwood Ave., City Employee—City of Oakland
Kathy D. Garcia, 472 Fair Oaks St., Student/Legal Secretary
Juan Ferretti, 651 Alvarado St., Retired
Richard V. Gordon, 734 Bush St., Minister of Religion
Mary E. Hall, 147 Upper Terrace, Real Estate Broker
Monroe T. Harris, 464 Hazelwood Ave., Sales Representative
Theresa Ella Harris, 464 Hazelwood Ave., Registered Nurse
Herbert M. Jacobson, 2030 33rd Ave., Retired
Frank E. Lamb, 715 Shotwell St., Retired
Beulah Lammers, 335 26th Ave., Retired
Gordon J. Lundberg, 642 Alvarado St., Unemployed
Adolfo Majewsky, 3307 Mission St., Real Estate Broker
Donald F. Odgers, 446 Ralston St., General Contractor
Charles Pitko, 456 Hazelwood Ave., Senior Clerk
Clarence R. Ricks, 626 Moraga St., Engineer
Humberto F. Rivas, 2870 44th Ave., Dry Cleaning Operator
Wilfred Gustave Scotti, 2340 Franklin St., Retired
Mrs. R. Shostac, 737 Hyde St., Retired
Leo A. Spencer, 20 Elgin Park, Retired Security Guard
Lula Deane Stenzel, 744 35th Ave., Nursing Home Owner
Sara D. Theis, 31 Riverton Dr., Retired
Charles G. Weston, 1265 Guerrero St., Clergy
Saeko Yazawa, 1426 18th Ave., Cosmetologist
FOR SUPERVISOR
JEFFREY J. DRAPEL

My name is Jeffrey J. Drapel.
My residence address is at No. 200 Madrid Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Waiter.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have been employed in San Francisco for 17 years. I know the problems of workers, home owners, and especially the renters of San Francisco. I’ll work full-time for jobs in San Francisco for San Francisco residents with equal rights, and responsibilities. Happiness, reduced crimes and reduced taxes for all of us will result. I believe in an elected Board of Education that holds the teachers accountable for progress of students. Assign most capable teachers to the disadvantaged schools instead of a massive transfer of students. I will not use my Supervisor position for any personal gain whatsoever.
Ballot designation: Waiter.
Signature of Candidate: JEFFREY J. DRAPEL.

The sponsors for Jeffrey J. Drapel are:
Frank J. Bawart, 17 28th St., Retired—Printing Pressman
Marie M. Bawart, 17 28th St. Housewife
Donwayne Benedict, 901 42nd Ave., C.P.A.
Margaret C. Burns, 132 Moffit St., Housewife
Mrs. Hilda Caruso, 8 28th St., Housewife
Neil E. Compton, 157 Westgate Dr., Retired
Renee Compton, 157 Westgate Dr., Bookkeeper
Helles Lenore Cosseboom, 1673 Sacramento St., Waitress
George Cramer, 1830 Noriega St., Sales
Betty F. Crawford, 7239 Geary Blvd., Printer
Richard W. Dickerson, 65 Newburg St., Waiter
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood Ave., Businessman
Kathy D. Garcia, 472 Fair Oaks St., Student/Legal Secretary
Edward E. Heavey, 1745 Sixteenth Ave., Lawyer
Rita U. Fernandez, 226 Madrid St., Beautician
Maria Teresa Frayne, 8 28th St., Homemaker
Mary E. Hall, 147 Upper Terr., Real Estate Broker
Ng Kok Khing, 3732 Kirkham St., Cook
Filippia Lougaris, 179 Madrid St., Housewife
Robert J. McKee, 147 Moffitt St., Police Officer
Mary A. Mencarelli, 214 Madrid St., Retired
Renato Mencarelli, 214 Madrid St., Retired
Adolph Pardini, 745 Brazil Ave., Cement Contractor
Efstathia Verreos, 201 Argonaut Ave., Housewife
Nick A. Verreos, 201 Argonaut Ave., Insurance Broker
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FOR SUPERVISOR
M. J. DRISCOE

My name is Michael Joseph Driscoll. My residence address is at No. 301 St. Francis Blvd., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Mortician. My qualifications for said office are as follows: These are days of upheaval nationally in our cities. San Francisco faces several paths it can follow. It can bow to the pressures of the extreme left or the extreme right. To do either will fan the sparks of chaotic violence or fanatic repression.

Or we can courageously continue to meet problems head-on.


I pledge battle for continuance of these policies.

Ballot designation: INCUMBENT.

Signature of Candidate: MICHAEL J. DRISCOE.

The sponsors for Michael Joseph Driscoll are:

Mrs. Regina Driscoll, 301 St. Francis Blvd., Housewife
Frank P. Agnost, 1517 Sacramento St., President Falcon Associates, Inc.
Joseph M. Alloto, 12 Healther Ave., Attorney
Thomas M. Brady, 2626 Kirkham St., Tax Consultant
Patrick M. Breen, 1926 48th Ave., President of Health Service
Edward F. Callanan, Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Dennis Carey, 1551 25th Ave., Executive Vice President Plbg. & Mech.

Contras. Assn.
George Y. Chinn, 719 Grant Ave., Lawyer
William Jack Chow, 550 Montgomery St., Attorney
Armond DeMartini, 110 32nd Ave., Educator
Joseph J. Diviny, 125 Cambon Dr., Intl. V.P. Teamsters
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Abel Gonzalez, 940 Treat Ave., Field Representative Labor Union Local 261
Curt Hayden, 200 Morningside Dr., Rental Contractor
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
Walter F. Kaplan, 1075 Broadway, Consultant
Nick Kontis, 307 Vicente St., Pres. of Hellenic American Societies
Morris Less, 142 9th Ave., Teamster Official
Marion McNerney, 724 Santiago St., Housewife
Marjane (John) Monaghan, 31 Grand View Ave., Secretary
Rev. Chester Lee Nelson, 740 Clayton St., Pastor of Church of the Living God
Mazie Cecilia Navin, 1354 26th Ave., Housewife
John D. O'Meara, 310 Arballo Dr., Vice President (Hibernia Bank)
Julia G. Porter, 142 27th Ave., Housewife
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., President Retired Employees of the
                      C & C of S.F.
W. M. Reedy, 355 Mangels Ave., Administrator
George R. Reilly, 2774 34th Ave., Member State Board of Equalization
John Shannon, 340 South Hill Blvd., Retired
Siro J. Viacava, 435 Sunnydale Ave., Plumbing Contractor
Morris Weisberger, 22 Beachmont Dr., Labor Executive
FOR SUPERVISOR
ALVIN DUSKIN

My name is Alvin Duskin.
My residence address is at No. 2546 Hyde Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Businessman.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I’m running on two
issues: the people’s right to vote on high-rise construction and
breaking the power of the big-money downtown interests by public
funding of campaigns. It is now clear that the Urban Design Plan
will not save the City from the ravages of mindless development.
We must let the people vote to offset the rigging of the system for
the real estate interests. We can make it illegal for big-money
downtown interests to control public officials by financing their
campaigns. I will run an initiative on campaign spending and as
Supervisor will protect and implement this initiative.
Ballot designation: Businessman.
Signature of Candidate: ALVIN DUSKIN.

The sponsors for Alvin Duskin are:
Harold A. Ashford, 364 Page St. #9, Attorney
Gil Bailie, 100 Varennes St. Apt. 5, Director, S.F. Ecology Center
John (L. J.) Bauer, 155 Jackson St., Promotion & Management
Leona W. Bergh, 4828 California St., Personnel Counsellor
Edward F. Bielski, 224 Magellan Ave. Student
Joseph Walter Bielski, 224 Magellan Ave., Student
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader St., Housewife
Fielding E. Cooley, 530 Congo St., Program Director S.F. Ecology Center
Michael Doyle, 731 Chestnut St., Educational Consultant
Ervin W. Dunn, 1293 Stanyan St., Retired Fireman
Patricia Farbman, 2504 Jackson St., Housewife
Stephen Gainer, 2016 Pacific Ave., Attorney at Law
Maurice Gibson, 3362 Sacramento St., Merchant
Hubin Glickman, 1130 Filbert St., Attorney
David R. Haight, 2250 North Point #4, Student
Mrs. Maryellen J. Haight, 2250 North Point #4, Student
Raymond L. Haight, 2250 North Point #4, Teacher
David G. Harrington, 184 Locksley Ave. #6, Computer Programmer
Pamela L. Harrington, 184 Locksley Ave. #6, Teacher
Perry-Lynn Moffitt Henn, 1150 Union St., Freelance Writer
William Thomas Lea, 3626 16th St., Public Relations
Jerold I. Mander, 1166 Filbert St., Advertising Agent
Harold McDermaid, 277 Stratford Dr., Attorney
Earl C. Moss, 4143 23rd St., Retired
John W. Murphy, 1405 7th Ave., Translator
Lloyd J. Newman, 2255 Lyon St., Executive
James Ralph Redhead, 640 Castro St., Student
Phyllis H. Ross, 199A Sweeney St., Retired Librarian
Miss Mary Carmella Shepper, 2075 California St. #402, Journalist
Charles Starbuck III, 1625 Leavenworth St., Attorney
FOR SUPERVISOR
PETER M. FINNEGAN

My name is Peter M. Finnegan. My residence address is at No. 824 Ashbury Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Assistant, California State Assembly. My qualifications for said office are as follows: Native San Franciscan, U.S.F. graduate, M.A. Political Science. Served U.S. Army, worked 3 years in government in Washington, D.C., Peace Corps volunteer in Venezuela, four years experience Legislative Assistant in the California State Legislature. I will be a full-time Supervisor. I will make every effort to fight red tape at City Hall. I believe in reforming the entire budget system so we can effect some real economy in City Hall. I am dedicated to preserving the economic vitality of the City. I am committed to bringing the Board of Supervisors back in touch with the citizens of San Francisco.

Ballot designation: Legislative Assistant.
Signature of Candidate: PETER M. FINNEGAN.

The sponsors for Peter M. Finnegan are:
Sarah A. Finnegan, 824 Ashbury St., Homemaker
Enda Bartley, 371 London St., Bar Owner
Antonio M. Bautista, 2260 9th Ave., Attorney
George R. Bianchi, 785 3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Roger Boschetti, 3325 California St., Union Official
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 102 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Rinaldo A. Carmazzi, 837 43rd Ave., Attorney
Alfred J. Cleary, 55 Rossmoor Dr., Businessman
Robert N. Colen, 246 Flournoy St., Truck Driver
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
J. P. "Pete" Finnegan, 116 De Soto Street, Investment Securities
Mary O. Canotico, 5715 Diamond Heights Blvd., Pension Analyst
Thomas F. Hayes, 120 Stonecrest Dr., Contractor
John F. Henning, Jr., 135 Westwood Drive, Attorney at Law
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes Ave., Architect
Julius Kahn, Jr., 2816 Broderick St., Attorney at Law
Richard L. Klein, 720 Quintara St., Real Estate Broker & Insurance Agent
Mary C. Leonoudakis, 687 14th Ave., Secretary
Anita G. Martinez, 62 Madrone Ave., Community leader Art Commissioner
James L. McShane, 1332 34th Ave., Supervisor of Surveyors, F.F.R.B.
Russell R. Miller, 41 Walnut St., Businessman
Herman D. Papa, 30 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law
Virginia J. Power, 140 Castenada Ave., Housewife
W. M. Ready, 365 Mangels Ave., Administrator
John (Jack) M. Riordan, 66 Vasquez Ave., Attorney at Law
Paul W. Vapnek, 3015 Baker St., Patent Lawyer
Charles J. Vassallo, 206 Somerset St., Real Estate Broker
Flora Torrano, 111 Valley St., Real Estate Saleswoman
Alan L. Wendroff, 839 Wisconsin St., Stock Broker
Marjorie Whelan, 140 Castenada Ave., Housewife
FOR SUPERVISOR  
TERRY A. FRANCOIS

My name is Terry A. Francois.
My residence address is at No. 20 Taraval Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Attorney at Law.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Supervisor since 1964. Member Finance, Streets and Transportation, State and National Affairs Committees; Chairman, Fire, Safety and Police Committee. Represent Board on ABAG, BCDC and Criminal Justice Council. Sponsor of Charter Revision, Police Community Relations, Yerba Buena Convention facility, Embarcadero Center and socially oriented low and moderate income housing, with priorities for the displaced. Strong supporter of lower muni fares, bus-stop benches and low-rent housing for senior citizens. Have fought destructive freeways, higher taxes and pollution.
Married; five children; home-owner, attorney-at-law, World War II Marine Corps veteran.
Ballot designation: INCUMBENT.
Signature of Candidate: TERRY A. FRANCOIS.

The sponsors for Terry A. Francois are:
Harold L. Zellerbach, 2288 Broadway, Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 82 Woodland Ave., S. F. Democratic County
 Central Comm. Chairman
Alvin I. Fine, 3330 Jackson St., Educator-Rabbi
William Jack Chow, 550 Montgomery St., Attorney
Benjamin H. Swig, 950 Mason St., Hotel Operator
Stephan C. Leonoudakis, 145 Uloa St., Attorney
Peter E. Haas, 313 Maple St., Businessman
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 698 Los Palmos Dr., Physician
Morris Weisberger, 22 Beachmont Dr., Labor Executive
Jackson Kee Hu, 819 Clay St., Real Estate Appraiser
William H. Chester, 432 Gold Mine Dr., Labor Union Official I.L.W.U.
Yoritada Wada, 565 4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Director
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gallert Dr., Labor Official
George R. Reilly, 2774 34th Ave., Member State Board of Equalization
William Moskovitz, 1901 California St., Retired
Joseph Belardi, 89 Woodhaven Ct., Labor Official
Peter Boudoures, 1200 California St., President Olympic Federal Savings
Cyril I. Magnin, 999 California St., Merchant
Rinaldo A. Carmazzi, 837 43rd Ave., Attorney
Elizabeth R. Kelley, 656 O'Farrell St., Business Agent Waitresses Union 48
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Merchant
Julia G. Porter, 142 27th Ave., Planning Commissioner
Osceola (Washington) Means, 344 Utah St.; Housing Associate Assistance
Patricia Monaghan, 31 Grand View Ave., Saleswoman
George T. Choppelas, 311 26th Ave., Attorney at Law
John Shannon, 340 South Hill Blvd., Retired
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus St., Public Accountant
Thomas P. Brady, 2620 Kirkham St., Tax Consultant
FOR SUPERVISOR
ROBERT E. GONZALES

My name is Robert E. Gonzales. My residence address is at No. 541 Missouri, Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney at Law. My qualifications for said office are as follows: Upon taking office, I set a number of goals. Many have already been achieved. My work on the Board includes legislation on education—employment—election reforms—a close working relationship with neighborhoods. I have authored a welfare reform study that has already saved the City $500,000, and when fully implemented will save the taxpayers $2,000,000. I carried the legislation that brought $7,500,000 (Federal funds) to San Francisco. I have authored tax reform legislation that will save $6,000,000. I stand on my record. I will continue to set realizable goals and thereby lead San Francisco towards a healthy and prosperous future.

Ballot designation: Incumbent.
Signature of Candidate: ROBERT E. GONZALES.

The sponsors for Robert E. Gonzales are:
Reno Baroschini, 1751 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Merchant
Manuel Ceballos, 1224 York St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Gold Mine Dr., Labor Union Official,
L.L.W.U. Vice Pres.
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 698 Los Palmos Dr., Physician
Matthew F. Connolly, 399 Fremont St., Catholic Priest
Mrs. Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businesswoman, 1st V/Pres, MAPA
Lewis E. Durham, 759 10th Ave., Methodist Minister
J. R. Garcia, 2401 Lake St., President Bartenders Union
Louis Garcia, 2326 Ninth Avenue, Attorney at Law
Carlton B. Goodlett, M.D., 1360 Turk St., Physician & Surgeon
John F. Greenegel, 2405 Octavia St., Chamber of Commerce Executive
Jackson Kee Hu, 619 Clay St., Real Estate Appraiser
Julius Kahn, Jr., 2816 Broderick St., Attorney at Law
Mrs. Eneas J. Kane, 2940 25th Ave., Housewife
Vernon Kaufman, 25 Presidio Terr., Wholesaler
Lawrence J. Mazzola, 296 Country Club Dr., Asst. Coordinator
Plumbers Union #38
Osceola P. Means, 344 Utah St., Housing Associate Assistance
Patricia Monaghan, 31 Grand View Ave., Saleswoman
William Moskowitz, 1901 California St., Retired
Hector Ortiz, 550 Missouri St., Attorney at Law
William A. Patton, 90 Pinehurst Way, President NAPPE Postal Alliance
W. M. Reedy, 365 Mangels Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
Hector Rueda, 378 Crescent Ave., Labor Union Executive
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett St., University Professor
Mary E. Sanchez, 172 Prentiss St., Job Agent
Dominick Strazzullo, 2444 Chestnut St., Fish & Restaurant Owner
John B. Sullivan, 23 Magellan Ave., Attorney at Law
Morris Weisberger, 22 Beachmont Dr., Labor Executive
My name is Noah Griffin.
My residence address is at No. 839 41st Avenue, San Francisco;
My business or occupation is Lawyer.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I believe that as a
native son of San Francisco and an active participant in the affairs
of this city I have the experience and background necessary to ful-
fill the position of Supervisor in the City and County of San Fran-
cisco. I do hereby declare myself a candidate.
Ballot Designation: Lawyer.
Signature of Candidate: NOAH GRIFFIN.

The sponsors for Noah Griffin are:
Noah W. Griffin, Sr., 830 41st Ave., Retired
Terressa E. Griffin, 839 41st Ave., Teacher
Elena Albert, 2156 Pacific Ave., Research Historian
Dante R. Andreotti, 651 Lisbon St., Law Enforcement
Anne B. Bloomfield, 2229 Webster St., Housewife
Rossie M. Colter, 1734 Greenwich St., Program Coordinator
Edna L. Faulks, 25 Cameo Way, Account Clerk
Thomas C. Fleming, 2339 California St., Editor Sun-Reporter
Marilou Foster, 567 9th Ave., Secretary
Armeng G. Garabedian, 191 Delmar St., Stationary Engineer
Doretha L. Greene, 551 Lisbon St., Supervisor U.S. Postoffice
Mildred L. Holthouse, 50 Church St., #202 Statistical Clerk
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood St., Criminologist
Mrs. Jule C. Johnson, 575 Ninth Ave., Executive Director—Reading is
Fundamental
Naomi Johnson, 25 Cook St., Retired
Dorrwin Buck Jones, 1960 Jones St., Gerontologist
Lucious Jones, 252 Sadowa St., Janitor
William E. Kilgore, 5420 Fulton St., Investigator
Alberta C. Lloyd, 576 15th Ave., Educational/Vocational Counselor
Anne Mahoney, 2760 Sacramento St., Secretary—Board of Education
Jean C. McBryan, 3590 Sacramento St., Retired R.N.
Ethel Ray Nance, 4173 Army St., Retired
Donald Nemir, 46 Darrell Place, Attorney
Michael Ozaki, 1147 Scott St., #434, Medical Records Clerk
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Dr., Clergy
David W. Sloan, 2369 Green St., Attorney
Robert J. Somerville, 176 28th Ave., Gen. Manager Radio Station KFOG
Margaret M. Sullivan, 51 Fortuna, Public Relations
Paul F. Thiebaut, 843 41st Ave., Insurance and Real Estate Broker
Mary I. Troutt, 1223 38th Ave., Secretary
My name is Quentin L. Kopp.
My residence address is at No. 450 38th Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Attorney at Law.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: During 17 years as a trial lawyer, I have actively participated in community, governmental and legal affairs. As City representative to the Bay Area Transportation Study Commission and a member of the San Francisco Charter Revision Commission, I am experienced in governmental processes. A past officer of Aid Retarded Children, International Institute, United Crusade and other organizations, I am committed to solving community problems. I pledge outspoken honesty and direct accessibility to every San Franciscan because I am determined to enhance our City as a distinguished, beautiful center of commerce and culture, and the respected home of friendly, progressive citizens.

Ballot designation: Attorney at Law.
Signature of Candidate: QUENTIN L. KOPP.

The sponsors for Quentin L. Kopp are:
Kaye Kopp, 450 38th Ave., Housewife
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Realtor
Leland Barrett, 860 Union St., Realtor & Insurance
A. M. Bautista, 2241 Sacramento St., Lawyer
Mrs. Dorothy M. Casper, 447 Chestnut St., Housewife
George Y. Chinn, 719 Grant Ave., Lawyer
William Jack Chow, 550 Montgomery St., Attorney at Law
Robert L. Coate, 18 Jordan Ave., Investment Executive
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Business Woman
Chadwick Ertola, 662 Greenwich St., Banker
Gus Farber, 100 St. Germain Ave., Jewelry Appraiser-Wholesaler
Harry W. Gluckman, 141 Kenwood Way, Service Representative
Stuart N. Greenberg, 2106 Jackson St., Investments
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
James S. Hurwitz, 1820 Webster St., Attorney
Kuzuma Ikezoe, 1157 Fell St., Newspaper Editor
Donald B. King, 35 Rockwood Ct., Attorney at Law
Robert F. Lynch, 111 Grijalva Dr., Investment Analyst
Clarissa Shortall McMahon, 2201 Leavenworth St., Attorney at Law
Russell R. Miller, 41 Walnut St., Businessman
Cheong Hing Mock, 447 32nd Ave., City Employee
Mrs. Margot Musial, 790 38th Ave., Housewife
Ray Nugent, 2458 Lombard St., Salesman
Kevin O'Shea, 50 Allston Way, Ins. Broker
Herman D. Papa, 30 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law
Thomas A. Reed, 2130 Fulton St., Professor
Charles B. Renfrew, 21 5th Ave., Attorney
James F. Thacher, 3979 Washington St., Lawyer
Nick A. Verreos, 201 Argonaut Ave., Insurance Broker
Frank D. Winston, 767 Burnett Ave., Attorney at Law
FOR SUPERVISOR
MARJORIE G. LEMLOW

My name is Marjorie G. Lemlow. My residence address is at No. 184 25th Ave., San Francisco; My business or occupation is Businesswoman, Housewife. My qualifications for said office are as follows: The past seventeen years of my life have been devoted to the school children of this city. As an active critic of a deteriorating public education system and a leader for good academic/vocational education for all children I have helped to unify public opinion against forced busing and the usurping of parental control. The life of our city depends on the stability of its families and retention of its middle class families within its boundaries. I pledge to work for a representative voice of the people and for a revitalized and unified San Francisco. Ballot designation: Businesswoman, Housewife. Signature of Candidate: MARJORIE G. LEMLOW.

The sponsors for Marjorie G. Lemlow are:
Morris Lemlow, 184 25th Ave., Tool Buyer
Lawana Addiego, 501 Diamond St., Homemaker
A. Edward Boyle, 20 Parker Ave., Consultant
Francis W. Claussen, 2258 36th Ave., S.F. School Teacher
George B. Croal, 659 35th Ave., Realtor
Frank Joseph DeOsuna, 2235A Market St., Public Relations Consultant
James A. Dever, Jr., 809 Joost Ave., Restaurant Manager
Stephen L. Downard, 371-C Chestnut St., Financial Analyst
Terence J. Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Insurance Agent
Neal A. Fellom, 147 Upper Terrace, Attorney at Law
Thomas II. Fox, 55 Merced Ave., Accountant
Mary E. Hall, 147 Upper Terrace, Real Estate Broker
Marion Haffey, 510 Hearst Ave., Housewife
David E. McCauley, 1260 Masonic Ave., Purchasing Agent
Geraldine C. McDonough, 2643 24th Ave., Housewife-Business Woman
Gaston M. Marcillac, 2543 22nd Ave., Programmer-Analyst
Charles D. Morgan, 657 14th Ave., Businessman
Mrs. Jan C. Myers, 135 Corona St., Housewife
Annabelle Y. Nakashima, 6026 California St. #203, IBM Keypunch
Edgar T. Ogier, 1619 44th Ave., Clerk
Ellen Elaine Phelps, 175 Brentwood Ave., Housewife
David S. Riser, 140 Gellert Dr., Manufacturer's Representative
Angelo Rostagno, 1414 25th Ave., Clerk
James J. Rourke, 3391 17th St., Business Agent
Marie Schneider, 1522 8th Ave., Clerk
Armand A. Schwartz, 3427 Irving St., Housewares Dept. Mgr.
Dorothy Stapleton, 2307 42nd Ave., Housewife
William K. Tom, 6241 California St, Pharmacist
Brenda Williams, 2140 Clement St., Housewife
April Yee, 400 28th Ave. #10, Key puncher
My name is Don Masalta.  
My residence address is at No. 903 So. Van Ness Ave., San Francisco.  
My business or occupation is Tax Consultant.  
My qualifications for said office are as follows: To have more representation from the minority group in order to solve problem directly affecting the minority community. As a member of the minority community I am in a better position to understand the problems of the minority community; thereby placing me in a favorable position to find alternate solution to the problems. To participate in the policy-making body from the standpoint of a minority.  
Ballot designation: Tax Consultant.  
Signature of Candidate: DONNELL N. MASALTA (DON)

The sponsors for Don Masalta are:  
Florita Linda Masalta, 903 So. Van Ness Ave., Secretary-Chief Insp. ATF  
Frank B. Bautista, 493 2nd Ave., Retired U. S. Army  
Anselmo Revelo, 1305 15th Ave., Accountant  
Benjamin P. Agustin, 546 34th Ave., Environmental Health Inspector  
Maximo L. Arcia, 1337 Church St.  
A. L. Robles, 217 Gates St., Clerk  
Ruperta Robles, 217 Gates St., Nursery Supervisor  
Celéstino T. Alafara, 503 Dolores St., Retired  
Juvencio C. Alquizar, 503 Dolores St., Retired  
Monico B. Luis, Sr., 1320 21st Ave., Insurance Life Underwriter  
Greg D. Carbonell, 2654 21st St., Agent  
Godofredo G. Calub, 1005 Market St. #407, Licensed Masseur  
Florentino P. Dizon, 246 11th Ave., Pantryman  
Cecilia S. Bonachita, 2319 43rd Ave., Benefit Authorizer (SSA)  
Joseph L. Soy, 186 Flournoy St., Administrative Supply Technician  
Frank Joseph Desuna, 2255A Market St., Public Relations Consultant  
Thomas N. Ryan, 1587 40th Ave., Librarian-Page  
Harold McDermid, 277 Stratford Dr., Attorney  
Jeffrey B. Chaskin, 523 33rd Ave., Student  
Tom Collins, 2133 Stockton St., President Irish American Higher Education;  
Executive Director Veteran's Council  
Jane Corbett, 520 Taylor St. #402, Office Worker  
John J. Corbett, 520 Taylor St., #402, Retired  
Jimmy S. Estrella, 540 Leavenworth St., Janitor  
Richard McGhee, 74 6th St., Warehouseman  
Mary E. Worthington, 545 O'Farrell St., #312, Retired  
Adolfo Majewsky, 3367 Mission St., Real Estate Broker  
John W. B. Thompson Jr., 949B Guerrero St., Teacher  
Juan Feretti, 651 Alvarado St., Retired  
Sue Carol Hestor, 4536 20th St., Administrator
FOR SUPERVISOR
RICHARD MARSHALL McGHEE

My name is Richard Marshall McGhee. My residence address is at No. 74 6th Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Teamster. My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have lived in S. F. 16 years and have a good idea about the City's problems. Ballot Designation: Teamster. Signature of Candidate: RICHARD McGHEE.

The sponsors for Richard Marshall McGhee are:
Jane W. Corbett, 520 Taylor St., Office Work
John J. Corbett, 520 Taylor St., Warehouseman
Jeffrey R. Chaskin, 525 33rd Ave., Student
Fabio de la Torres, 508 Precita Ave., Director "Centro Latino"
John Del Carlo, 700A Precita Ave., Student
Edward F. Dolan, 2306 Market St., unemployed
John Ferreira, 665 Eddy St., Retired
Sue Carol Hestor, 4536 20th St., Administrator
Walter Keane, 315 5th St.
Orlan Lattimer, 575 Eddy St., Truck Driver
Marjorie G. Lemlow, 184 25th Ave., Businesswoman-Housewife
Robert A. Lewis, 3752 16th St., Laborer-Musician
Mary Madsen, 650 Ellis St., Social Worker
Harold McDermid, 227 Stratford Dr., Atty.
William W. Meyers, 39-A McCoppin St., Student
Janice Moore, 2215A Clement St., Sr. Stenographer
Lee B. Nichols, Jr., 771 Waller St., Salesman
Albert Allen Orlovitz, 650 Ellis St., Gymnasium Instructor
Lee Geo. Perraud, 1217-H Turk St., unemployed
Ellen Elaine Phelps, 175 Brentwood Ave., Housewife
David Reynolds, 3752 16th St., unemployed
Steven T. Robertson, 4155 Army St., Political Worker
Douglas Rodgers, 896 45th Ave., Architect
Mary Helen Rogers, 1219 Webster St., Community Worker
Thomas N. Ryan, 1587 40th Ave., Librarian-Page
Victoria Ryan, 1527 40th Ave., Student
John W. B. Thompson, Jr., 949-B Guerrero St., Teacher
Gerry Torres, 244 Rutledge St., Civil Engineer
Remigio E. Valido, 2032 Baker St., Oceanographer
Brenda Williams, 2140 Clement St., Housewife
My name is Robert H. Mendelsohn.
My residence address is at No. 11 Santa Monica Way, San Francisco;
My business or occupation is Businessman.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Elected to Board of
Supervisors in 1967. Chairman, Health and Environment Committee;
member, Finance and Fire, Safety and Police Committees. Succeed-
fully urged use of State gas tax and Water Department surpluses to
reduce property tax. Responsible for Board’s hiring budget analyst,
which produced significant economies. Authored legislation that
resolved garbage disposal problems, reduced Bay sewage pollution,
and provided drug abuse treatment and alcoholism detoxification
programs and more responsible General Hospital. Introduced meas-
ures to improve neighborhoods and public transportation and pro-
vide increased law enforcement and housing. Married. One son, in
public school. Marine Corps veteran. U. C. graduate. Former assis-
tant, Senator McAtee.
Ballot designation: Incumbent.
Signature of Candidate: ROBERT H. MENDELSON.

The sponsors for Robert H. Mendelsohn are:
Ingrid Mendelsohn, 11 Santa Monica Way, Housewife-Student
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Merchant
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
William K. Coblenz, 10 Fifth Avenue, Attorney
Arthur H. Coleman, M.D., 698 Los Palmos Dr., Physician
Hans A. Feibusch, 96 Turquoise Way, Engineer
Alvin I. Fine, 3330 Jackson St., Educator-Rabbi
Franz E. Glen, 609 Burnett Ave., #3, Electrician
Robert J. Grassilli, 2840 San Bruno Ave. Apt. 1, Real Estate
Jackson Kee Hu, 619 Clay St., Real Estate Appraiser
Aga Jarek, 67 Woodland Ave., Chairman, S.F. Democratic County
Central Comm.
Dorothy Kaplanis, 600 18th Ave., Housewife
Vernon Kaufman, 25 Presidio Terr., Wholesaler
Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 330 Chestnut St., Insurance Executive
Joseph Mazzola, 127 Lakeshore Dr., Labor Representative
Frances M. McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Park and Recreation Commissioner
William E. McDonnell, 365 Castenada Ave., Businessman
William Moskovitz, 1901 California St., Retired
Piero Patri, 801 Wisconsin St., Architect
William L. Porter, 1020 Union St., Lawyer
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., President Retired Employees C & C of S. F.
W. M. Reedy, 365 Mangels Ave., Administrator
George R. Reilly, 2774 34th Ave., Member State Board of Equalization
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
E. Robert Scrofani, 265 Laidley St., Teacher
Edward E. Serres, 132 Ewing Terr., Attorney at Law
Fred H. Smith IV, 220 16th Ave., Manufacturers Representative
Melvin M. Swig, 1880 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Investor
Yoritada Wada, 565 4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Director
Bernice Watkins, 1625 Eddy St. Apt. #401, Community Service Rep.,
S. F. Redevelopment Agency.
FOR SUPERVISOR

JOSEPH N. MINAHAN

My name is Joseph N. Minahan.
My residence address is at No. 1377 9th Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Consulting Youth Sociologist.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: The results of my 8 year Intensive Investigation and Research in my native city of San Francisco from 1962-70, as a nationally recognized Consulting Sociologist, Youth Consultant and Social Problems Specialist in the Labor Management, Health, Education and Welfare fields proved that our Economy, Employment, Education and Enforcement, were priority problems and issues in all districts in San Francisco which verified our solutions of Economy, Employment, Education, Enforcement, to make San Francisco the City of Peace again.
Ballot designation: Labor-Management Consultant.
Signature of Candidate: JOSEPH N. MINAHAN.

The sponsors for Joseph N. Minahan are:
Eleanor Barbieri, 29 Masonic Ave., Advertising Business
Robert Barbieri, 29 Masonic Ave., Advertising Business
Allen J. Barsocchini, 1724 Filbert St., Retired R.R.
Thomas P. Brady, 2626 Kirkham St., Tax Consultant
Stella Buhner, 2209 Moraga St., Stenographer—San Francisco's Boys' Club, Inc.
Ruth A. Butler, 781 O'Farrell St., Retired
David R. Dobleman, 1610 12th Ave., Retired Police Officer
Walter Fairbairn, 1258 5th Ave., Insurance Underwriter
Vincent M. Fallon, 1502 39th Ave., Ass't. Director—CCD Dept. of Education
Archdiocese of San Francisco
Marie A. Fischer, 1831 29th Ave., Office Manager—San Francisco Boys' Club, Inc.
Robert L. Fisher, 1738 11th Ave., Educator, S. F. Unified School District
Joe C. Gerlach, 1457 7th Ave., Plumber
Ulysses W. Grant, 736 Irving St., Restauranteur
John A. Horstmann, 309 1/2 Judah St., Public Relations
Jack Janian, 425 Judah St. Apt. 102, Cabinet Maker, Retired
Frank S. Johnson, 895 91st Ave., Retired Fireman
Jack Madrid, 1291 8th Ave., Window Cl.
George E. McGuire, 809 Lincoln Way, Custodian Lincoln High
Mary Agnes Minahan, 400 Avila, Audit Clerk RR
Rita G. Minahan, 46 Rockaway Ave., Housewife
William Moskovitz, 1901 California St., Retired
Elmer B. Northgrave, 765 O'Farrell St., Bartender
Lois C. O'Connor, 1011 Anza St., Key Punch Operator
Cecelia Shinn, 1282 Third Ave., Student S. F. State College
Richard A. Shinn, 1282 3rd Ave., Mail Carrier
Daniel J. Todd, 1418 30th Ave., Bartender
Evelyn Martha Wilson, 1467 7th Ave., Housewife
Lorane E. Wilson, 1395 10th Ave., Clerk
FOR SUPERVISOR
JOHN L. MOLINARI

My name is John L. Molinari.
My residence address is at No. 435 Magellan Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Businessman.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born in San Francisco, educated at Lowell High School and University of San Francisco. Married, with one child attending public grammar school. Currently President of the Civil Service Commission, I authored legislation which placed more police on the streets of San Francisco at a substantial cost saving. I am aware of the decline in our City environment as the result of City government's failure to solve the problems facing everyone—spiralizing taxes—increasing crime rate—school deterioration, both educationally and physically, now coupled with forced busing. These problems must be solved. I am dedicated to solving them.

Ballot designation: Businessman.
Signature of Candidate: JOHN L. MOLINARI.

The sponsors for John L. Molinari are:
Louise K. Molinari, 435 Magellan Ave., Housewife
Carlos Abd, 221 21st Ave., Retired
John J. Barbacalata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Realtor
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Merchant
B. John Bugatto, 3248 Baker St., Attorney at Law
William Jack Chow, 550 Montgomery St., Attorney
Armon DeMartini, 110 32nd Ave., Educator
Robert C. Elkus, 469 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Richard P. Figone, 1937 Taylor St., Attorney at Law
John J. Goodwin Jr., 2551 16th Ave., President—Gibraltar Savings & Loan Assn.
Edgar A. Hils Sr., 30 Lopez Ave., Transportation Consultant
Samuel A. Ladar, 1918 Vallejo St., Attorney
Morris Less, 148 9th Ave., Labor Official
J. W. Mailllard III, 2740 Green St., Businessman
Thomas A. Maloney, 350 Missouri St., Insurance Broker
Helen R. Molinari, 1260 Lombard St., Housewife
William Moskovitz, 1901 California St., Retired
William J. Murphy, 45 Stonecrest Dr., Lawyer
George R. Reilly, 2774 34th Ave., Member State Board of Equalization
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner Andres Radio & TV
S. M. Saroyan, 67 San Andreas Way, Lawyer and Businessman
Roy Scala, 1735 Beach St., Merchant
John Tarantino, 3544 Divisadero St., Insurance Broker
Helen Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Housewife
Timothy J. Twomey, 2026 Lawton St., Labor Union Representative
Nick A. Veheos, 201 Argonaut Ave., Insurance Broker
Yoritada Wada, 565 4th Ave., YMCA Executive Director
William J. Welsh, 63 San Anselmo Ave., Pac. Tel. & Tel. Supervisor
Thomas W. S. Wu, 508 38th Ave., Doctor of Dental Surgery
My name is Robert G. Nelson.
My residence address is at, No. 527 - 26th Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Insurance Brokerage Vice-President.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: As President of Concerned Parents' Association, I have for the past three years led the responsible opposition to forced busing of San Francisco schoolchildren. I have also long advocated and spoken out for an elected and representative Board of Education. I strongly support badly-needed welfare reform. I stand behind our police department and oppose irresponsible attempts to abolish our valuable and valiant tactical squad. I will continue to speak out as the voice of the truly self-determined, self-reliant "man in the middle" of every race, color and creed, who at present is being ignored.
Ballot designation: Businessman — Concerned Parent.
Signature of Candidate: ROBERT G. NELSON.

The sponsors for Robert G. Nelson are:
Bertha Nelson, 527 26th Ave., Wife-Mother
Harry J. Aleo, 1285 Monterey Blvd., Realtor
Marjory M. Amino, 1815 16th Ave., Housewife and Mother
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Realtor
B. John Bugatto, 3240 Baker St., Attorney at Law
George T. Chappell, 311 26th Ave., Attorney at Law
Allan Drucker, 2176 15th Ave., Restaurant Manager
Willis D. Hannaway, 75 Junipero Serra Blvd., Attorney at Law
Ben Elkus, 849 Noriega St., Insurance Broker
Hag G. Harootianian, 770 22nd Ave., Fireman
Robert Charles Hill, 1083 Portola Drive, Attorney
Hein M. Hilz, 445 9th Ave., Principal
William T. Hogan, 111 Villa Terrace, Realtor
Frank A. Jacobsen, 462 10th Ave., Clergyman
Julius Kahn, Jr., 2816 Broderick St., Attorney at Law
Lansing Kwok, 1000 North Point St., Merchant
John O. Mack, 2963 23rd Ave., Attorney
Murray M. Montgomery, 69 Rossi Ave., Retired Colonel, U. S. Army
John F. Miggins, Jr., 251 Parnassus Ave., Sales Mgr.—Matson Nav. Co.
Andres J. Mouretatos, #1 Twin Peaks Blvd., Architect
Loretta W. Parker, 674 Huron Ave., Housewife
Angelo Pera, 30 Palos Place, Pres. Sheelli Bros. Inc.
Richard G. Raffetta, 550 Myra Way, Realtor
Michael S. Salamone, 95 Crestlake Dr., Owner, Andres T.V.
Ibrahim Tawasha, 4816 Fulton St., Businessman
Masato T. Toki, 2643 44th Ave., Dry Cleaner
Nick A. Verreos, 201 Argonaut Ave., Insurance Broker
Boris Vertloogin, 1761 16th Ave, President of Russian Center
James Wong, 3426 Anza St., Data Processing Manager
My name is Ronald Pelosi. My residence address is at No. 18 Sixth Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Businessman. My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born in San Francisco, educated at St. Ignatius and Stanford. Married, with three children, living in the Richmond district. I served as President of the City Planning Commission, and as your Supervisor I have fought to preserve San Francisco's history and insure its future. I will continue to fight for lower taxes, budget reform, jobs, and greater citizen safety through positive crime deterrents. Decisive action is always preferable to delay and evasion. This is the mark of political leadership. You will always know where I stand. Ballot designation: Incumbent.

Signature of Candidate: RONALD PELOSI.

The sponsors for Ronald Pelosi are:
Barbara Pelosi, 16 6th Ave., Housewife
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402 20th St., Youth Director
Mario A. Borja, M.D., 722 Cayuga Ave., Physician
F. Everett Cahill, 716 Junipero Serra Blvd., General Research Supervisor P.T.&T.
Edward F. Callanan, Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Rinaldo A. Carmazzi, 837 43rd Ave., Attorney
Caroline M. Charles, 850 Francisco St., Housewife
Rev. Harry J. Chuck, Jr., 920 Sacramento St., Presbyterian Clergyman-Youth Director
Wm. Hunt Conrad, 1948 Pacific Ave., Public Relations
Ransom M. Cook, 850 Powell St., Retired
Lily Cuneo, 3619 Jackson St., Housewife
Don Fazzackerley, 170 El Verano Way, Banker
Alvin Fine, 3330 Jackson St., Educator-Rabbi
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus Street, Public Accountant
Francis O. Fehr, 185 San Felipe Way, Landscape Architect
Donald B. King, 35 Rockwood Ct., Attorney at Law
Edward J. Leveroni, 758 Green St., Banker
Thomas C. Lynch, 98 Clarendon Ave., Attorney at Law
Stephen D. Maffini, 860 Sutter St., Lawyer
Anita G. Martinez, 62 Madrone Ave., Community Leader & Art Commissioner
Daniel R. McCarthy, 1320 36th Ave., Student
Mrs. Amy Waters Meyer, 5627 Clement St., Co-chairman, People for a Golden Gate Recreation Area
W. M. Reedy, 365 Mangels Ave., Administrator
Charles B. Renfrew, 21 5th Ave., Attorney
Edward E. Serres, 132 Ewing Terr., Attorney at Law
Stanley H. Sinton, Jr., 1020 Francisco St., Executive
Elaine M. Sundahl, 1230 19th St., Housewife
Rose M. White, 306 Delano Ave., Labor Representative
Harold L. Zellerbach, 2288 Broadway, Consultant
My name is Rev. Edward Preston.  
My residence address is at No. 387 Wilde Avenue, San Francisco.  
My business or occupation is Humidor Manager.  
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I hereby declare myself as a candidate for the above position on the following qualifications. First I am an American Citizen, a graduate of Washington High School and attended Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. I was the president of the Lee Seville Counsel in Clev. Ohio for (4) years, youth organizer of the Sunnydale area (S.F.) for (3) years, Secretary of the Bayview pre-school program in (S.F.), and an ordained minister. I believe “All people should be treated equal.”  
Ballot designation: Minister.  
Signature of Candidate: EDWARD PRESTON.

The sponsors for Rev. Edward Preston are:
Ella Mae Bean, 1851 La Salle Ave., Cosmetologist  
Laura Braden, 1438 Quesada Ave., Housewife  
Henry Brooks, 336 5th St., Retired  
Martin Chew, 1143 Filbert St., Retail Clerk  
Dorthea Franklin, 70 Reddy St., Housemother  
Ollie Garner, 177 Tara St., Asst. Housemother  
Henry Gordon, 2532 Post St., Warehouseman  
James L. Head, 407 Broadway, Electrician  
Ezzie Jackson, 2076 Palou Ave., Minister  
Timothy Jackson, 1559 La Salle Ave., Janitor  
Flora Jean Knighten, 1178 Quesada Ave., Grocery Store Owner  
Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 1547 Hudson Ave., Bus Operator  
Elonzy Ogletree, Jr., 625 York St., Supervisor of Music  
Lena Preston, 387 Wilde Ave., Cook  
James W. Robinson, 319 Athens St., Boiler Mkr. Retired  
Martin Russel Rypins, 1227 Clay St. #1, Field Life Underwriter  
Mrs. Louise Sanders, 44 Exeter St., Nursery School Attendant  
Rev. Hamilton A. Scott, 1567 Oakdale Ave., Bus Operator  
Burke Stevenson, 45 Hale St., Retired  
Mack Taylor, 89 Carr St., Retired  
Evelyn J. Tharp, 30 Esquina Dr., Homemaker  
Cedric Watson, 586 Campbell Ave., Physical Therapy Aid  
Tena O. Watkins, 1167 Palou Ave., Sec. Clerk of Providence Bapt. Church  
Roe Mary Watson, 586 Campbell Ave., Merchandise Adjuster
My name is Mary Helen Rogers.
My residence address is at No. 1219 Webster Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Relocation Specialist.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a resident of San Francisco, a black woman, a mother of twelve children, a former welfare mother, a renter, a tenant organizer, a supporter of all causes for civil liberties and equal opportunity for all people. This background fully qualifies me to bring the poor and disenfranchised the kind of representation enjoyed by the type of interests already represented in city government.

The problems of housing, education, youth, employment and welfare are so critical to the survival of San Francisco’s poor and disenfranchised that one who is directly affected by them must be represented on the Board of Supervisors.
Ballot designation: Community Worker.
Signature of Candidate: MARY HELEN ROGERS.

The sponsors for Mary Helen Rogers are:
(Sister) Patricia M. Cafferty, 573 Scott Street, #7, Social Worker, Catholic Social Service
William J. Middleton, 1621 York St., Urban Planner
Mary C. Tall, 1864 McAllister St., Missionary
Tombe French, 1330 Turk St., Secretary
Doris E. Beans, 2735 Bush St., Receptionist
Yoritada Wada, 503 4th Ave., YMCA Director
Robert B. Covington, 210 Divisadero St., Exec. Director
Rev. Hannibal A. Williams, 217 Anza Vista, Clergyman
Elizabeth P. Meredith, 3824 21st St., Homemaker
Harry James Tate, Jr., 244 Laussat St., Laundry Worker
Mrs. Kathryn Turner, 253 Missouri St., Housewife
Laura Mae Hines, 927 Fulton St., Maid
Germaine Ward, 521 Castro St., Student
Charles E. Macklin, 442A Guerrero St., Teacher
Peter P. Mendelsohn, 74 3rd St., Co-chairman of T.O.O.R.
James V. Gibbs, 1450 Divisadero St. #303, Clinical Laboratory Technologist
Sarah W. Williams, 2060 O’Farrell St. #300, Housewife
Earl J. DeShaw, 630 Oak St., Truck Driver
Eloise M. DeShaw, 630 Oak St., Housewife
Inez Andry Frazier, 640 Oak St., Housewife
John C. Petroni, 546 Fillmore St., Catholic Priest
John C. Diamante, 83 Divisadero St., Citizen
Harold A. Ashford, 364 Page St. #9, Attorney
Annie L. Burr, 364 Page St., Postal Clerk
John W. Murphy, 1405 7th Ave., Translator
My name is James J. Rourke.
My residence address is at No. 3691 17th Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Labor Representative.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Resident of San Francisco for 59 years, educated in San Francisco schools. Past President Holy Name Society, Mission Dolores. Member Grand Jury-1966. Award of Merit from San Francisco Community of Rehabilitation Workshops. Vice President Taxpayers Revolt United Endeavor. Affiliations: Knights of Columbus, South of Market Boys, Marin Rod and Gun Club, Grand Jurors, P.A.L. and Teamsters 85. Wife: Barbara - Sons: Jim and Matthew - Daughter: Margaret. Support of our Police and Fire Department, Anti-busing; elected Board of Education-Tax limitation on property-tax relief for all Senior Citizens-Safety for all citizens on streets of San Francisco.
Ballot designation: Labor Representative.
Signature of Candidate: JAMES J. ROURKE.

The sponsors for James J. Rourke are:
Mrs. Barbara E. Rourke, 3691 17th St., Homemaker
Barney Apfel, 46 Grand View Terr., Labor Official
Phillip N. Bartholomew, 30 Stoneman St., Sec-Treasurer Local 85
M. T. Belway, 631 35th Ave., Shipyard Executive
John Busko, 3364 22nd St., Retired
George B. Croal, 659 35th Ave., Realtor
John R. Cuff, 144 Collins St., Bookkeeper
Tom Curtin, 2925 Larkin St., Dist. Sales Mgr.
Frank C. Doherty, 2445 22nd Ave., Union Pension Administrator
Theodore T. Dolan, 124 Juanita Way, Union Official
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood Ave., Businessman
James T. Dunne, 321 Bartlett St., Exec. Chuff, City & Co. S.F. P.U.C.
Aileen Dwyer, 1335 Willard St
Terence J Faulkner, 2371 42nd Ave., Insurance Executive
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Drive, Labor Official
George E. Harrington, 105 Laidley St., Teamster Union Representative
Mary Ann Harrington, 105 Laidley St., Housewife
Edward E. Heavey, 1745 16th Ave., Lawyer
Edward L. Humphreys, 2983 25th St., Retired Teamster
Maude A. Humphreys, 2983 25th St., Retired Clerk
Beulah Lammers, 333 26th Ave., Retired
Marjorie G. Lemlow, 184 25th Ave., Businesswoman-Housewife
Morris Less, 142 9th Ave., Teamster Local Official
Edmond Mayers, 71 Bradford St., Business Manager, Retired
Teamsters Loc. 85
Geraldine C. McDonough, 2643 24th Ave., Housewife-Businesswoman
Diane L. McGoldrick, 1369 12th Ave., Senior Steno
George P. Pedrin, 68 Castro St., Union Official
Marion E. Pedrin, 68 Castro St., Traffic Engineer
Thomas E. O'Donnell, 400 Goettingen St., Business Agent
FOR SUPERVISOR
THOMAS N. RYAN

My name is Thomas N. Ryan. My residence address is at No. 1587 40th Ave., San Francisco. My business or occupation is City Employee. My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a city employee, I have witnessed the gross mismanagement of our City’s resources, both public and private. I am not afraid to speak out against this corruption thrust upon San Franciscans by a Board of Supervisors controlled by the Nob Hill gang. Economic atrocities must stop. I will expose them and stop them.

Ballot designation: Librarian-Page.
Signature of Candidate: THOMAS N. RYAN.

The sponsors for Thomas N. Ryan are:
Anne Roughton, 1590 Sacramento St. #40, Librarian, San Francisco Public Library
Franklin M. Heynemann, 357 Arguello Blvd., Student
John Carter, 467 Frederick St., City Employee-Public Library
Joan S. Dillon, 1460 Webster St. #4, Librarian
Sandra J. Drissen, 1644 Clay St. #6, Librarian
Louise Santoro, 1261 41st Ave., Librarian
Hella H. Rains, 1812 23rd Ave., Librarian
Gerald Damian Lee, 2372 46th Ave., Student, San Francisco State College
Nancy Thomas Musser, 1244 California St. #1, Librarian
Richard McGhee, 74 6th St., Warehouseman
Rosie J. Colbert, 67 Nichols Way, Library Page
Robert A. Lewis, 3752 16th St., Laborer-Musician
David L. Reynolds, 3752 16th St., Musician
Kathleen E. Foote, 83 Divisadero St., Legal Assistant
William W. Meyers, 39A McCoppin St., Student
Annie L. Burr, 364 Page St. Apt. 9, U.S. Postal Clerk
Victoria Ryan, 1527 40th Ave., Student
Susan Migdoll, 1741 11th Ave., Secretary
Janice Moore, 2215A Clement St., Sr. Stenographer
Judith C. Aldridge, 458 Union St., Student
Jane Corbett, 520 Taylor St., Office Worker
John J. Corbett, 520 Taylor St. #402, Retired
James Stuart Ball, 719 Rhode Island St., Photographer
Donnell N. Masalta, 903 So. Van Ness Ave., Tax Consultant
Phillip Galgiani, 2626 Larkin St., Artist
George Ranjo, 27 Excelsior Ave., Library Assistant
Sue Carol Hestor, 4536 20th St., Administrator
Van H. Furlough, 559 Orizaba St., Deputy Sheriff
Steven T. Robertson, 4155 Army St. #10, Political Worker
FOR SUPERVISOR
MARK R. SCHNEIDER

My name is Mark R. Schneider.
My residence address is at No. 1015 Masonic Ave., No. 11, San Francisco.

My business or occupation is Socialist.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a young (23) anti-war activist, I feel I represent the majority of San Franciscans, who support immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. I would organize active support to the anti-war movement and also to the G.L.'s in the Bay Area who are demanding their civil rights. My campaign also supports the democratic and human rights of all citizens, particularly the oppressed national minorities, women, workers, senior citizens and the gays who are not now represented by the Board of Supervisors. I am a member of the Socialist Workers Party.

Ballot designation: Socialist.

Signature of Candidate: MARK R. SCHNEIDER.

The sponsors for Mark R. Schneider are:
John L. Guebel, Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St., Apt. #8 Socialist Worker
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Nathan Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Jessica R. Star, 1015 Masonic Ave., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey A. Berchenko, 62-A Sanchez St., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey L. Beneke, 354 Sanchez St.
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 366A Sanchez St., Mail Clerk
Peggy Joan Bunn, 112 Turquoise Way, unemployed
Duncan E. Gordon, 3868 18th St., Letter Carrier
Milton T. Chee, 3624 16th St., Socialist Worker
Laura Dertz, 3864 18th St., Socialist Worker
Lawrence Hyink III, 4077A 18th St., Postman
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
James K. Gotesky, 1405 Franklin St. #305, unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee) Organizer

Jane Sica, 412 Foerster St., Socialist
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Carole Seidman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
Richard L. Winger, 1655 Greenwich St., Claims Authorizer
Barbara P. Deur, 350 Noe St., #8, Librarian
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Miss Bonnie Joy Bompart, 352 Sanchez St., Student
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Thomas M. Harper, 1327 45th Ave. #1, Postal Clerk
Sheeldon P. Colvin, 131 Lake St., Printer
FOR SUPERVISOR
MRS. BONNIE SUE SHEPPARD

My name is Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard. My residence address is at No. 129 Henry Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Student.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am the 26 year mother of a 4½ year old son and a staff member of the Northern California Peace Action Coalition. Last November, the people of San Francisco voted in favor of immediate withdrawal from Vietnam on Proposition J. Many of the problems facing San Francisco are a direct result of U.S. intervention in Southeast Asia. As an antiwar activist since 1965, I feel I represent the majority of San Francisco voters. As a mother, I feel there is a real need for child care centers. I would make these facilities available to all who need them.

Ballot designation: Socialist Worker.
Signature of Candidate: MRS. BONNIE SUE SHEPPARD.

The sponsors for Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard are:
Roland Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Housepainter
John L. Goebel, Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St., Apt. 8, Socialist Worker
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Nathan Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Mark R. Schneider, 1015 Masonic Ave., #11, Socialist
Jessica R. Star, 1015 Masonic Ave., Socialist Worker
Barbara B. Deur, 350 Noe St., #6, Librarian
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 366A Sanchez St., Mail Clerk
Jeffrey A. Berchenko, 62A Sanchez St., Socialist Worker
Jeffrey L. Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., unemployed
Peggy Joan Bunn, 112 Turquoise Way, unemployed
Milton T. Chee, 3624 16th St., Socialist Worker
Laura Dertz, 3864 18th St., Socialist Worker
Duncan E. Gordon, 3866 18th St., Letter Carrier
Lawrence Hyink III, 4077A 18th St., Postman
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
James K. Gotesky, 1405 Franklin #305, unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee)
Organizer
Carole Seidman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
Richard L. Winger, 1655 Greenwich St., Claims Authorizer
Jane Sica, 412 Foerster, Socialist
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Bonnie Joy Bompart, 322 Sanchez St., Student
Thomas M. Harper, 1327 45th Ave., Apt. 1, Postal Clerk
Sheldon P. Colvin, 131 Lake St., Printer
My name is Jane Sica. My residence address is at No. 412 Foerster Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Socialist.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am active in building the National Action on November 20 in San Francisco to demand the Repeal of all Abortion Laws. The city of San Francisco must make Abortions and Birth Control information available for every woman who needs them. I feel I represent the women who want control of our own reproductive lives. As a student I feel every high school and college should provide full Birth Control information and services for women students. I am a member of the Socialist Workers Party and City College Young Socialist Alliance. Ballot designation: Socialist.

Signature of Candidate: JANE SICA.

The sponsors for Jane Sica are:
James K. Gotesky, 1405 Franklin St. #305, Unemployed
Mark Zola, 3624 16th St., Social Worker
Dean S. Reed, 62A Sanchez St., SMC (Student Mobilization Committee) organizer
Barbara B. Deur, 330 Noe St. #6, Librarian
Howard L. Wallace, 3518 16th St., Warehouseman
Richard L. Winger, 1655 Greenwich St., Claims Authorizer
Carole Seidman, 471 Guerrero St., Housewife
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Edmund Anthony Jurenas, 2306 Market St., Soldier
Joseph S. Ward, 3866 18th St., Dishwasher
Milton T. Chee, 3624 16th St., Socialist Worker
Sylvia Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Housewife
Jeffrey A. Berchenko, 62A Sanchez St., Socialist Worker
Mark R. Schneider, 1015 Masonic #11, Socialist
John L. Goebel, Jr., 639 24th Ave., Student
Robert S. Schwarz, 545 Frederick St. Apt. 8, Socialist Worker
Sandra L. Peck, 545 Frederick St., Paste-Up Artist
Miss Patricia A. Bethard, 1630 Sutter St. #14, Secretary
Mrs. Bonnie Sue Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Maye S. Torres, 244 Rutledge St., Homemaker
Jon M. Teitelbaum, 366A Sanchez St., Mail Clerk
Lois Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unit Secretary
Nathan Weinstein, 128 Henry St., Socialist Worker
Roland Sheppard, 129 Henry St., Housepainter
Miss Bonnie Joy Bompart, 352 Sanchez St., Student
Thomas M. Harper, 1327 45th Ave. Apt. 1, Postal Clerk
Jeffrey L. Beneke, 354 Sanchez St., Unemployed
Peggy Joan Dunn, 112 Turquoise Way, Unemployed
Sheldon P. Colvin, 131 Lake St., Printer
My name is Stephen Roger Tietjen.
My residence address is at No. 421 Eureka Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Personnel Executive.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I feel that today’s Supervisor needs administrative experience to efficiently tackle San Francisco’s problems. My years in the Personnel field provide me with the ability to administer the wages and benefits of the City’s 20,000 employees. My goal as Supervisor would be to retain our desperately needed middle income families which serve as San Francisco’s moral fiber and stabilizing force. I will bring a “Citizen’s” point of view to the Board. I refuse to believe that a Supervisor must be political and unresponsive to the needs of the people. It’s time that an Unpolitician was elected to the Board.
Ballot designation: Personnel Executive.
Signature of Candidate: STEPHEN R. TIETJEN.

The sponsors for Stephen R. Tietjen are:
Joan Marie Anderson, 37 Miraloma Drive, Financial Planning Consultant
Douglas Binderup, 528-27th St., Claim Manager
Hedwig Chilote, 809 Pine St., Cafeteria Mgr.
Larry W. Cooke, 1450 Chestnut St., Supervisor—Western States
Bankcard Assn.
Stanley Cotton, 2161 Hayes St., Carpenter
Emmett M. Cottrell, 764 Elizabeth St., Police Insp. Ret.
Helen M. Crivello, 59 Medau Place, Assistant Supervisor
Russell G. Davis, 165 North Point St. #219, Stockbroker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood St., Businessman
Diane M. Duran, 2169 Green St., Secretary
Janice M. Duran, 2169 Green St., Clerk
Paul M. Eisen, 455 Upper Terrace, Advertising Executive
Edward F. Fernandez, 570-18th Ave., Retired, Major US Army
Gerald P. Guerin, Jr., 218 Moreland St., Food Broker
John T. Harrington, 152 Anza Vista Ave., Physician & Surgeon
Alexandra Kuzon, 1185 Shotwell St., Housewife
Alfred J. Lombardi, 128 Cotter St., Business Agent Butcher’s Union Local 115
Gordon J. Lundberg, 642 Alvarado St., Unemployed
Lillian Morton, 1849 Golden Gate Ave., Encoder
Dino Polizziani, 619 Athens St., Business Agent Butcher’s Union #115
Jayne Reverdy, 1183 Shotwell St., Bridal Buyer, Ranshooffs
Frank A. Sanchez, 239 Hamilton St., Insurance Agent
David A. Schultz, 956 Sacramento St., Apt. 102, Credit Analyst
Priscilla J. Silvestri, 549 Green St., Assistant Supervisor
Colleen B. Smith, 3520-23rd Street #3, Deputy Sheriff
Dorothy B. Swanson, 452 Pacheco St., Housewife
Judy Ann Tietjen, 421 Eureka St., Housewife
Eugene Womack, 327 Church St., Banker
Susie C. Woods, 2035 California St., #104, Accountant
Yvonne Yezzi, 480 Lombard St., Input Clerk
My name is Gerry Torres.
My residence address is at No. 244 Rutledge Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Civil Engineer.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a resident of S.F. for 21 years; as a husband with children, grandchildren and other relatives in this area; as a veteran, professional engineer with 26 years of state and federal service; as a private businessman, and as one deeply involved in community problems; as a person whose devotion to my city and its people stands foremost in my thoughts, who seeks prompt and effective solutions to both new and old problems; I feel that I am highly qualified to fulfill the great demands of the office for which I seek election.
Ballot designation: Civil Engineer.
Signature of Candidate: GERRY TORRES.

The sponsors for Gerry Torres are:
Josephine Almodovar, 930 Avalon Ave., Salesclerk
Ralph Almodovar, 930 Avalon Ave., Auto Mechanic
Gustie H. Andrakin, 1022 De Haro St., Housewife
Hilda Beverforden, 235 Rutledge St., Office Supervisor
H. D. Beverforden, 235 Rutledge St., Artist Framar
Helen Boortz, 574 21st Ave., Registered Nurse
Tom Collins, 2133 Stockton St., Executive Director Veterans' Council
Jane Corbett, 520 Taylor St. #402, Typist
Robert F. Finch, 1390 Market St., Civil Engineer
Hayes G. Garver, 370 32nd Ave., Apt. 2, Architect
Victor L. Haack, 3224A Market St., Electrical Engineer
Janet J. Hasselman, 50 Elsie St., Bookkeeper
Arthur Hileman, 835 Peralta St., Packaging Director
Barbara J. McEnaney, 245 Rutledge St., Margin Clerk
Theodore H. Miller, 538 43rd Ave., Electrical Engineer
Edgar T. Ogier, 1019 44th Ave., Clerk
Leo H. Quinones, 336 Hoffman Ave.
Mary Quinones, 336 Hoffman Ave., Housewife
Estanisloa Rodriguez, 506 Hill St.
Armando Rosario, 336 Hoffman Ave., Retired
John C. Shannon, 1774 9th Ave., Truck Driver (Dispatcher)
Kay Shlicoff, 1009 Rhode Island, Homemaker
Fabio de la Torres, 508 Precita Ave., Director of “Centro Latino”
Jiro Taguchi, 878 37th Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Marie L. Torres, 508 Precita Ave., Housewife
Maria Teresa Torres, 77 Alston Way, Reconciler (Computer)
Maye Sanguinetti Torres, 244 Rutledge St., Homemaker
Joyce Walker, 154 Del Monte St., Medical Claims Adjuster
My name is Samuel Unger.  
My residence address is at No. 83 Seward Street, San Francisco;  
My business or occupation is Proprietor of S.U.M.S.  
My qualifications for said office are as follows: "Sam; "The Peoples Man" Motto—"San Francisco advancing—towards a higher quality of life for San Franciscans." Ten of my 21 Platform Planks:—District Supervisor Elections; Extend Merit System; Transfer Education to Supervisors; No Increase in Tax Rate or Dollars Paid; Non-Vigilante Citizens Participation Program to Battle Crime; Property Tax Relief for Pensioners; Two Year Moratorium on High Rise; Low Interest City Fund to Repair Homes: A Nickel All Day Every Day for "65ers"; Restore Park Windmills. I am among the 141,000 San Franciscans over 60 years old, 1/5th of our population, who want to be represented by their peer. 
Ballot designatión: Management—Tax Service. 
Signature of Candidate: SAMUEL UNGER.  

The sponsors for Samuel Unger are:  
Wendy Burkeyville, 1941 Mission St. #16, Secretary  
Jeffrey R. Chaskin, 525 33rd Ave., Student  
K. A. Cihak, 822 Alvarado St., General Contractor  
Robert Clutton, 954 Ashbury St., Artist  
Julie A. Costanzo, 902 Noe St., Page—Student  
Geraldine J. Coughlin, 1040 Greenwich St. Apt. 5, Journalist  
Richard C. Culver, 512 Dewey Blvd., Realtor  
Simon Corry, 2145 17th Ave., Carpenter Foreman  
Georganne Delapenha, 970 Elizabeth St., Registered Nurse  
Les Dранic, 4239 22nd St., Jeweler  
Katherine Dunnigan, 14 Portola Dr., Housewife  
Cheryl Fahrner, 301 Hoffman Ave., Housewife & Mother  
Richard David Farhner, 301 Hoffman Ave., Antique Dealer  
Mrs. Hazel A. Fields, 137 Gambier St., Housewife  
Paul J. Garvey, 118A Fair Oaks St., Bookseller  
Frank J. Glynn, 130 San Rafael Way, Branch Manager; Savings & Loan Assn.  
Carmel R. Holmes, 1338 Douglass St., Wife of a Machine Tool Leadman  
Edgar N. Jones, 1246 Castro St., Inventor  
Athanasios D. Lagios, 1955 16th Ave., Self-employed Businessman  
Gertrude Laney, 1735 Van Ness Ave. #602, Director, Reading Guidance Center  
Robert A. Lewis, 3752 16th St., Laborer—Musician  
Janice Moore, 2215A Clement St., Senior Stenographer  
Catherine Murphy, 3853 22nd St., Housewife  
Denis T. Murphy, 3853 22nd St., Real Estate Investor  
Laura Thorne Newcomb, 1144 Church St., Registered Nurse  
Peter O’Rourke, 3853 22nd St., Hod Carrier  
Alan P. Ritchie, 50 Seward St., Salesman-Food Broker  
Becky Schettler, 2801 Mission St., Florist  
John T. Shannock, 264 Jersey St., Tool & Die Maker  
Raymond Shelby, 332 Jersey St., Retired
FOR SUPERVISOR

YVONNE RENEE WESTBROOK

My name is Yvonne Renee Westbrook.
My residence address is at No. 148 Beulah Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Student.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a candidate for Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, I submit my work experience and involvement in civic and community affairs. As an eighteen year old, I have always felt the need to help mold and orientate my peers in the importance of our youths' voice and participation in civic and state affairs.

I have been actively involved in the following: Board of Directors, Western Addition Project Area Committee; Secretary, City Wide Youth Council; Young Adults Incorporated; Haight Ashbury Youth Board; Secretary, Black Students Union (City Wide); Board of Directors, Keadrans Community Center; Health Service Committee for Hunters Point.

Ballot designation: Student.

Signature of Candidate: YVONNE WESTBROOK.

The sponsors for Yvonne Renee Westbrook are:
Cecil Williams, 739 32nd Ave., Clergyman
Idoree Westbrook, 148 Beulah St., Community Lausian Worker
Bertha Robinson, 1788 Palou, Foster mother
Benjamin N. Moore III, 148 Beulah St., Free Agent Scout
Elsie Suttle, 149 Thrift St., Cosmetologist
Claudine Burns, 2121 Geary Blvd. #301, Elementary Teacher
Dwight K. Jackson, 36 Northridge Rd., Student
Orazo Dillon, 843 Hayes St., Community Works and Student
Bettye L. Wright, 1788 Palou Ave., Social Worker
Charlene Richter, 442 20th Ave., Youth Counselor
Rev. David A. Jones, 2211 Castro St., Apt. 201, Minister
Ann Weldon, 732 Peralta Ave., Actress-Singer
Eugene J. Boyle, 546 Fillmore St., Clergyman
William J. Middleton, 1621 York St., Urban Planner
Harold A. Albury, Jr., 459 Turk St., #307, Unemployed
A. C. Ubalde, Jr., 3884 21st St., Clergyman
Lewis E. Durham, 759 10th Ave., Methodist Minister
Patricia Durham, 759 10th Ave., Housewife
Lloyd K. Wake, 2358 40th Ave., Clergyman
Raymond J. Jordan, 999 Laguna St., Apt. Manager and Special Police
Harvey M. LaSalle, 959 Capitol Ave., Youth Developer
Maria Johnson, 103 Capitol Ave., Student
Robert B. Covington, 210 Divisadero St., Exec. Director
FOR SUPERVISOR
MICHAEL WONG

My name is Michael Wong.
My residence address is at No. 138 Trenton Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Student.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a 20 yr. old college student and a lifelong residence of S.F. My qualifications are my age, associations with the young and being a member of the Minority race of this city and county. My associations with the poor and Third World Peoples have brought on an awareness of the common needs of the working class and poor.
Ballot designation: Student.
Signature of Candidate: MICHAEL KIM WONG.

The sponsors for Michael Wong are:
Robert E. Kahn, 525 10th Ave., Student
Steven Sum, 1750 33rd Ave., Student
Anna S. Gowing, 1666 35th Ave., Housewife & Student
Georgina Susan Knight, 120 Albion St., Student
Christopher T. Dunworth, 120 Albion St., Student
John P. McCloskey, 115 ½ Andover St., Student
H. Brown Miller, 501 Foerster St., Teacher
Stanley Cotton, 2161 Hayes St., Carpenter
Jocelyn Won, 1444 Leavenworth St., Student
Dennis H. Fong, 782 Myra Way, Student
John Bird, 25 Northwood Drive, Student
Cecilia Madrid, 200 Van Ness Ave., Student
Edward J. Pembroke, 1785 Waller St., Student
Leland L. Leonard, 565 Valley St., Student
Patricia Horan, 839 Shrader St., Student
Gerald J. Chan, 1422 Sacramento St., City Planner
Mrs. Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Businesswoman
Donna Charlene Choy, 38 Perry St., Student
James F. O'Donnell, Jr., 128 Moreland St., Student
Sherman Lee, 635 7th Ave., Student
Lynette Fung, 1600 Mason St., Student
Victor Yee, 443 14th St., Student/Teacher's Aide
Jeannie Chee, 443 14th St., Student/Clerk
Albert Leong, 756 43rd Ave., Computer Programmer
Norma Jin, 16 Harwood Alley, Student
Dorothy Lew, 1407 Powell St., Student
Ronald Dong, 1749 Leavenworth St., Student
Jeanie Lim, 12½ Ross Alley, Student
Peter F. Mendelsohn, 74 3rd St., Co-chairman T.O.O.R. Chief Steward retired
Lisa Vaughan, 443 14th St., Student
My name is Morris Maxwell Woods Jr.
My residence address is at No. 1822 19th Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Cable Car Conductor.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am 35 years old, of Scotch, Irish and Sicilian descent. An ex-marine of the Catholic faith. I am married and have 2 children. I have been a working man for the last 23 years. I intend to do my utmost to restore our city, which is my birthplace, to its proper place as a leader in Education, Civil Rights, and a haven for the working man.
Ballot designation: Cable Car Conductor.
Signature of Candidate: MORRIS MAXWELL WOODS JR.

The sponsors for Morris Maxwell Woods Jr. are:
Don A. Allen, 1325 Somerset St., Muni Conductor
Richard P. Blenio, 828 Greenwich St., Merchant Seaman
Joseph Bologna, 133 Addison St., Cable Car Gripman
Mary Agnes Brennan, 4563 25th St., Secretary
Mylla Burton, 1642 Larkin St., #5, Clerk Typist
Robert Lee Coats, 154 Victoria St., Cable Car Conductor
Patricia J. Cornulius, 590 Francisco St. Apt. 339, Clerk
Peter Cresci, 3233 Broderick St., Electrical Contractor
Richard Epstein, 1312 Jackson St., Taxi cab driver
James Robert Gregory, 240 20th Ave., Muni Gripman
Michael T. Hanley, 2625 35th Ave., Motorman Municipal Railway
Ozell Harris, 1467 Newcomb Ave., Conductor—Cable Car
William D. A. Kremen, 1815 12th Ave., Conductor—Cable Car
Joseph E. Lacey, 51 Chattanooga St., Conductor, Municipal Railway
Barbara Mae Luoma, 2200 Larkin St. #9, Claims Examiner
Lawrence E. McClanahan, 210 Broderick St., Gripman
Michael J. McClure, 1541 California St., Motorman
Peter P. Mendelsohn, 74 3rd Street, Co-chairman T.O.O.R. Retired Seaman
Victoria Portera, 243 Oxford St., Housewife
Judy A. Rooney, 494 2nd Ave., P.B.X. operator
Salvatore Russo, 78 Bridgeview St., Retired
Vincenzo Russo, 512 Persia Ave., Retired
Geo. M. Sullivan, 4380 17th St., Conductor
Charles L. Turner, 1249 Brussels St., Cable Car Conductor
Frank S. Viollis, 449 Lombard St., Teacher Children's Center & Student
Kathryn V. Viollis, 449 Lombard St., File Clerk
Ann Leal Williams, 1328A Pacific Ave., Assistant Manager
William Preston Witt, 222 Leavenworth St., Operator Muni Railway
Jane C. Wittrock, 1328A Pacific Ave., Assistant Loan Counsellor
FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY
JOHN JAY FERDON

My name is John Jay Ferdon.
My residence address is at No. 16 Sea Cliff Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is District Attorney.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Born in this city, graduated from local schools, the University of San Francisco, and Hastings College of Law. Served four years in the Army Counter-Intelligence Corps. For nineteen years engaged in the private practice of the law and taught at San Francisco Law School. For twelve years served as a Supervisor, twice as President. District Attorney since 1904, performing with integrity, considered judgment, constant advocacy in the interests of the entire community with full protection of the rights of all involved. I pledge to maintain the high reputation of this office, gratefully acknowledge past support, and respectfully ask retention.
Ballot designation: District Attorney.
Signature of Candidate: JOHN JAY FERDON.

The sponsors for John Jay Ferdon are:
Nancy C. Ferdon, 16 Sea Cliff Ave., Housewife
Hrant J. Avakian, 440 Gellert Dr., Manufacturer
John R. Bryan, 160 San Buena Ventura Way, Physician
F. B. Butler, 18 25th Ave., Retired
Edward A. Barry, 1410 Portola Dr., Attorney
Mary Margaret Casey, 70 Shore View Ave., Executive
William H. Crowell, 639 32nd Ave., Realtor
Charles J. David, 2634 Franklin St., Hotel Owner
Daniel Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Dr., Apt. 7K, Labor Representative
Jane M. Ferdon, 2 Parker Ave., Librarian
Marie V. Gatti, 134 Westgate Dr., Homemaker
Elena Lenci, 1740 Broadway, Housewife
Jack M. Lipman, 591 Spruce St., General Contractor
Thomas C. Lynch, 38 Clarendon Ave., Attorney at Law
Garret McEnerney, II, 1035 California St., Attorney
Wilson Meyer, 2288 Broadway Apt. 7, Executive
Anne P. O'Hara, 3414 Washington St., Housewife
Marcella M. O'Shaughnessy, 2671 17th Ave., Retired, School Dept.
Andre J. Pechoultres, 537 Marina Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Virginia B. Peery, 160 Castenada Ave., Homemaker
Cecil F. Poole, 90 Cedro Way, Attorney at Law
Hadie Redd, 470 Joost Ave., Chief District Attorney Investigator
Henry Schindel, 54 Scherwin St., Furniture Store Owner
C. J. Scollin, 370 Castenada Ave., Insurance Executive
Charles P. Seully, 200 Gellert Dr., Attorney
J. Joseph Sullivan, 314 San Leandro Way, Attorney at Law
John H. Swanson, 3140 Mission St., Bowling Owner
R. J. Swettmann, 2920 Ulloa St., Attorney
Joseph N. Wineroth, Jr., President L. A. Giacobbi Co., Inc.
Francis Q. Yee, 1535 Jones St., Dentistry
FOR SHERIFF
WILLIAM C. BIGARANI

My name is William C. Bigarani.
My residence address is at No. 512 Joost Avenue, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Inspector of Police, (Sergeant).
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Native San Franciscan of Irish-Italian ancestry, graduate of Sacred Heart; University of San Francisco. Attended Law School for two years, and completed courses in Civil and Criminal law, Labor-Management, and Administration. Veteran, honorably discharged. I will bring to the Sheriff's office humane, economic and efficient administration. Establish a Labor-advisory board for job placement of inmates upon release. Institute Drug, Alcohol, work-furlough, vocational guidance, educational programs, and training for deputies. Improve jail and courtroom security; create Enforcement Unit, thus elevating deputies to Peace Officers. Seek outside funding, to finance these local programs, relieving the overburdened local taxpayer.
Ballot designation: Inspector of Police (Sergeant).
Signature of Candidate: WILLIAM C. BIGARANI.

The sponsors for William C. Bigarani are:
Mildred F. Bigarani, 512 Joost Ave., Housewife
Harry L. Bigarani, 1384 York St., Union Official
Virginia C. Bigarani, 1384 York St., Housewife
Dolores Ayala, 297 Richland Ave., Public Relations
Wady F. Ayoob, 3566 20th St., Retired Letter Carrier
Peter Bavei, 4789 19th St., Business Representative Upholsterer Union #3
Helen E. Buckley, 1019 Guerrero St., Homemaker
Richard G. Castro, 523 Vidal Dr., Police Inspector
George T. Choppelas, 311 26th Ave., Attorney at Law
Leslie F. Craig, 209 Stillings Ave., Retired
Irene Crowley, 222 University St., Housewife
Dr. Ramiro Cruz, 231 Ellis St., Dentist
George F. Ellis, 384 Baltimore Way, Retired
Morris R. Evenson, 583 10th Ave., Union Secretary
J. Edw. Fleishnell, 30 Miller Place, Lawyer
Myrl Gemalin, 160 Dellbrook Ave., Business Manager Glaziers 718
Nick Geracimos, 261 Capistrano Ave., Automobile Salesman
Gerald J. Harrington, 4111 24th St., Bartender
Lauryne R. Hurley, 1426 33rd Ave., Businesswoman and Housewife
Gilbert G. Lee, 2809 24th St., Realtor
Florence Shipsey Mahoney, 96 Sotelo Ave., Housewife
Clara K. McInden, 2329 32nd Ave., Retired
Dorothy M. Polietta, 2807 Bryant St., Secretary-Bookkeeper
Alma Quinn, 2222A 20th St., Retired
Louis H. Reyff, Jr., 49 Devonshire Way, Retired Police Officer
Mrs. LeVerea Schexnayder, 1544 McAllister St., Telephone Operator
Ernest A. Schoene, 102 Tapia Dr., President, Packet Postal Corporation
Doris F. Stidhem, 3240 Taraval, Retired Accountant
FOR SHERIFF

MATTHEW C. CARBERRY

My name is Matthew C. Carberry. My residence address is at No. 1542-34th Ave., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Sheriff City and County of San Francisco.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Experience, and proven record of performance. As incumbent sheriff, I have been responsible for handling more than 173,118 prisoners and have collected millions of dollars under the law and in 010,210 legal processes accounted for every dollar involved. Extensive experience in public and private administration. Native San Franciscan and graduate of University of San Francisco. I ask your vote so we can continue our program of economy and efficiency, tempered with humanity.

Ballot designation: Sheriff of San Francisco.

Signature of Candidate: MATTHEW C. CARBERRY.

The sponsors for Matthew C. Carberry are:
Stella Pisani Carberry, 1542 34th Ave., Homemaker
Edward A. Barry, 1410 Portola Dr., Attorney
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Merchant
Marie Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Automobile Dealer
Dr. Leonard Busterna, 59 Brighton Ave., Oral Surgeon
Vincent J. Callan, 4038 19th St., Accountant
William H. Chester, 432 Gold Mine Dr., Labor Union Official I.L.W.U.
Vice-Pres.
Jack K. Dooling, 2209 Gough St., Attorney
Don Fazackerley, 170 El Verano Way, Banker
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Dr., Labor Official
Conrad J. Grieder, 2567 22nd Ave., Electrical Manufacturer
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortes Ave., Architect
Fred H. Huie, 672 16th Ave., Stockbroker
Jack S. Kusaba, 6 Chicago Way, Executive
John D. O'Meara, 310 Arbello Dr., Vice President Hibernia Bank
Julia G. Porter, 142 27th Ave., Planning Commissioner
James C. Purcell, 74 Ashbury Terr., Lawyer
Anthony J. Quigley, 2027 16th Ave., Attorney at Law
William T. Reed, 2151 18th Ave., President Retired Employees C. & C. of S.F.
W. M. Reedy, 365 Mangels Ave., Administrator
Maláchý Ruane, 250 College Ave, Plastering Contractor
Albert Shumate, M.D., 1901 Scott St., Physician
Francis J. Smith, 186 Miraloma Dr., Undersherriff City & County of S.F.
Spiron J. Tentes, 2651 Broadway, Public Accountant-Inheritance
Tax Appraiser
Kazue Togasaki, M.D., 1848 Buchanan St., Physician & Surgeon
Emile D. Torre, M.D., 1686 Union St., Physician
Ed Turner, 175 San Leandro Way, Union Official
Siro Viacava, 435 Sunnydale Ave., Plumbing Contractor
Marguerite A. Warren, 1748 32nd Ave., Public Relations
Morris Weisberger, 22 Beachmont Dr., Labor Executive
FOR SHERIFF

RICHARD DUANE HONGISTO

My name is Richard Duane Hongisto.
My residence address is at No. 65 Wood Street, San Francisco.
My business or occupation is Criminologist.
My qualifications for said office are as follows: Simple law enforcement experience is not enough for the key position of Sheriff of San Francisco . . . The breakdown of our criminal justice system is apparent. Old approaches have failed. A competent Sheriff's team of New Professionals is needed. As criminologist, police science instructor and veteran San Francisco police officer, I place a unique set of qualifications at the service of San Franciscans. Without additional cost to taxpayers, I will bring to this office professionally qualified people who will upgrade the Sheriff's Department from failure not just to mediocrity, but to become a model program for the whole United States.
Ballot designation: Criminologist.
Signature of Candidate: RICHARD D. HONGISTO.

The sponsors for Richard Duane Hongisto are:
Dante R. Andreotti, 521 Lisbon St., Law Enforcement
Arthur K. Bierman, 1528 Shrade St., Professor of Philosophy
Charles Clay, 688 Elizabeth St., Organizer
Anne B. Daley, 795 Geary St., Office Worker
Troy H. Dangerfield, 155 Bridgeview Dr., Policeman
Lewis E. Durham, 759 10th Ave., Methodist Minister
Thomas C. Fleming, 2339 California St., Editor, Sun-Reporter
Olga Gallegos, 150 Corona St., Homemaker
Washington E. Garner, 150 Urbano Dr., Physician & Surgeon
Noah W. Griffin, 839 41st Ave., Retired
Fr. James A. Hagen, 1200 Florida St., Catholic Priest
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820 47th Ave., Industrial Consultant
Joseph M. Jackson, 413 Holloway Ave., Union Representative
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Homemaker
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., Chairman, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Dorrwin Buck Jones, 1950 Jones St., Gerontologist
Gordon J. Lau, 1385 24th Ave., Attorney
Naomi E. Lauter, 23 Presidio Terrace, Housewife
Larry R. Littlejohn, 1648 Page St., Small Businessman
Ellinore E. Lurie, Ph.D., 119 Madrone Ave., Sociologist
Edward L. Peet, 350 Arbello Dr., Clergy
William M. Plath, 814 Grove St., President, Society for Individual Rights
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
Ernest W. Rover, 2386 Pacific Ave., Contract Bridge Director
Edward Stern, 66 Yerba Buena, Attorney
Lawrence Swaim, 1224 De Haro St., Postal Clerk; Vice President, Local 2, American Postal Workers Union (AFL-CIO)
FOR SHERIFF
MATTHEW "MATT" O'CONNOR

My name is Matthew "Matt" O'Connor. My residence address is at No. 508 Larkin Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Supervising Narcotic Agent, Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born and raised in San Francisco. My college education was law enforcement oriented. I have served over twenty years in law enforcement. First with the San Francisco Police Department, then with the Department of Justice—the last twelve years as supervising agent which has the administrative responsibility over the regional area of Northern California. The emphasis of my career has been two-fold: proper education and treatment of individuals involved in drugs... apprehending major narcotic traffickers and investigating organized crime. I am a consultant to the San Francisco Unified School District and several National Institutes.

Ballot designation: Law Enforcement Administrator.
Signature of Candidate: MATTHEW O'CONNOR.

The sponsors for Matthew "Matt" O'Connor are:
Elizabeth O'Connor, 508 Larkin St., Housewife
Rudolf Bertolozzi, 1992 Alemany Blvd., Retired
Isaac J. Butler, 154 Dakota St., Jr. Rate Clerk
Peter J. Byrne, 60 Diamond St., Construction Laborer
George M. Carr, 3360 Octavia St., Attorney
Versa A. Cullen, 325 Buckingham Way, Librarian
John J. Bogue, Jr., 2110 28th Ave., S.F. Fire Dept.
Hugh C. Byrne, 4399 Army St., Fire Fighter
Hugh Christopher Byrne, Jr., 4399 Army St., Apprentice Carpenter
Bernard A. Dunne, 1038 Castro St., Banker
Albert R. Gughemett, 331 Holyoke St., Fireman
Maria O. Hernandez, 2861 Harrison St., PBX Receptionist
Mildred O. Jakway, 2421 Judah St., Retired
James D. McGovern, 317 Hazelwood Ave., Fire Fighter
Gertrude McIntyre, 1627 Rivera St., Housewife
Agnes McKevitt, 231 Prague St., Housewife
Merritt R. McKevitt, 231 Prague St., Police Lieut. S.F.P.D.
Dorothy C. Nissley, 292 San Jose Ave., Housewife
George T. Oberlander, 174 Stratford Dr., Professor, San Francisco State College

Frances Ossolinski, 446 Funston Ave., Secretary
Oris Pacco, 263 Seneca Ave., Contractor
Michael Perri, 159 Lakeshore Dr., Real Estate Loan Broker
Joseph Prado, 469 Bartlett St., Helper
Mrs. Arlene Majorie Pratt, 7227 Geary Blvd., Physician-Housewife
Esmee Romero, 500 Bartlett St., Waitress
Richard R. Romero, 500 Bartlett St., State Police
Anthony G. Sacco, 125 Otsego Ave., Fire Fighter
Victoria Shinskey, 3401 Clay St., Secretary
John P. Smith, 85 Hillcrest Ct., Painter
Gregory S. Stout, 2399 Washington St., Attorney
George Y. Chinn has been nominated by the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, subject to confirmation by the voters, to a five year term commencing January 8, 1972 as a member of the Board of Education.

Mr. Chinn submits the following statement of his qualifications:

As a native San Franciscan with children attending our public schools, I am deeply disturbed at the lack of faith and confidence of our citizens toward the school board.

I share also the concern of San Francisco parents over the erosion of quality education in our schools resulting from sincere but misguided leadership.

A strong school board responsive to the needs and desires of the community is vital for the future of our children.

I intend to make every effort to regain that lost public confidence by closing the communications gap and encouraging more community participation in our schools.

Signature:  
GEORGE Y. CHINN

Subscribed and sworn to, before me, on the 17th day of September, 1971.
FRANK R. QUINN
Deputy Registrar of Voters, City and County of San Francisco, Calif.
BOARD OF EDUCATION
DR. EUGENE S. HOPP

Dr. Eugene S. Hopp has been nominated by the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, subject to confirmation by the voters, to a five year term commencing January 8, 1972 as a member of the Board of Education.

Dr. Hopp submits the following statement of his qualifications:
Providing quality integrated education for the children of San Francisco must be the overriding consideration of the School Board.
Emphasis should be placed on upgrading educational programs at the primary level when the children achieve the study skills that dictate their future capabilities.
Quality education requires a closer working relationship and cooperation between parents and teachers, school administrators, and members of the School Board so that parents’ hopes and aspirations for their children can be realized.
We must be assured that we receive full educational value for our school dollars, particularly at a time of deep economic difficulties.

Signature:

DR. EUGENE S. HOPP M.D.

Subscribed and sworn to, before me, on the 15th day of September, 1971.
EMMERY MIHALY
Registrar of Voters, City
and County of San Francisco, Calif.
(PROPOSITIONS A, B, C & D)

ORDINANCE CALLING SPECIAL BOND ELECTION

FILE NO. 394-71

ORDINANCE NO. 228-71

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1971, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSITIONS TO INCUR BONDED DEBTS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS, TO WIT: $56,180,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; $34,000,000 FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE HARBOR OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND ITS FACILITIES; $3,850,000 FOR ADDITIONS TO AND ALTERATION AND RECONSTRUCTION OF A PORTION OF THE HALL OF JUSTICE BUILDING; $8,491,000 FOR ADDITIONS TO AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE EXPENDITURES GREATER THAN THE AMOUNTS ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HERINABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION.

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

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 2nd day of November, 1971, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county propositions to incur bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco for the acquisition, construction or completion by the city and county of the hereinafter described municipal improvements in the amounts and for the purposes stated:

(a) PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING BONDS, 1971

$56,180,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the public schools of the City and County of San Francisco, including the building or purchasing of school buildings and educational facilities, the making of alterations or additions to the school building or buildings and educational facilities other than such as may be necessary for current maintenance, operation or repairs, the demolition or razing of any school building with the intent to replace it with another school building, whether in the same location or in any other lo-
cation, together with reconstruction and improvement of the school buildings and educational facilities to meet such standards of structural safety as are established in accordance with law, and all other works, properties or structures necessary or convenient for such municipal improvement.

(b) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971

$34,000,000 to pay the cost of improvement of the Harbor of the City and County of San Francisco and its facilities, including wharves, piers, seawalls, railroads, spurs, streets and appurtenances to any of the foregoing and personal or real property used in connection therewith, and when necessary, dredging or filling in connection therewith; said work of improvement to be constructed with due regard to the environmental beauty of San Francisco Bay, public access, or public recreation facilities, within or within the vicinity of the areas improved under this ordinance.

(c) HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971

$3,850,000 to pay the cost of additions to and alterations and reconstruction of a portion of the Hall of Justice Building to provide additional courtrooms and related rooms for the Superior and Municipal Courts, including furniture, fixtures, equipment, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for said improvement.

(d) FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971

$8,491,000 to pay the cost of additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco, including equipment and all works, property, appurtenances and structures necessary or convenient for additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco.

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

Public School Building Bonds, Resolution No. 410-71, $56,180,000;
Harbor Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 412-71, $34,000,000;
Hall of Justice Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 413-71, $3,850,000;
Fire Protection Systems Improvement Bonds, Resolution No. 411-71, $8,491,000.

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

The method and manner of payment of the estimated costs of the municipal improvements described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amounts specified.
Said estimates of cost as set forth in said resolutions, and each thereof, are hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated costs of said improvements, and each thereof.

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

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Municipal Election to be held Tuesday, November 2, 1971, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Municipal Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Municipal Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Municipal Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Municipal Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or about October 19, 1971.

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

(a) "PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $56,180,000 for the improvement of the public schools in the City and County of San Francisco, including additions to and reconstruction, replacement, alteration and improvement of existing school buildings and educational facilities."

(b) "HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $34,000,000 for the improvement of the Harbor of the City and County of San Francisco and its facilities."

(c) "HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $3,850,000 for additions to and alteration and reconstruction of a portion of the Hall of Justice Building to provide additional courtrooms and related rooms for the Superior and Municipal Courts."

(d) "FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $8,491,000 for additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco."
To vote for any proposition where ballots are used, and to incur the bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "Yes." To vote against any proposition and thereby refuse to authorize the incurring of a bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "No."

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

Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on any proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 7 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

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

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

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

Approved as to form:

THOMAS M. O'CONNOR, City Attorney

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.
Noes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Tamaras.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk


Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.
Noes: Supervisor Barbagelata.

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk


JOSEPH L. ALIOTO, Mayor

**PROPOSITION A**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING BONDS, 1971.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $56,180,000 for the improvement of the public schools in the City and County of San Francisco, Including additions to and reconstruction, replacement, alteration and improvement of existing school buildings and educational facilities.

**ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION A**

Proposition A will authorize a bonded indebtedness of $56,180,000 for school purposes to provide, among other things, classrooms for elementary school children which conform with State (Field Act) earthquake standards.

**Vote Yes on Proposition A**

State law specifies that local school districts must reconstruct or replace the schools which do not conform to earthquake safety standards according to the Field Act. The law has set a deadline of June 30, 1975, to complete this work or abandon the buildings. In San Francisco, approximately 50% of the elementary school classrooms do not comply with the Field Act.

This bond plan is part of a master planning process which includes engineering studies of the schools, population projections of classroom needs for the next 10 years, cost analysis and the development of a precise planning and construction system and staff to insure completion of the work within the legally required time limits.

The plan is specific as to the identification of the schools involved and the extent of work to be done on each, as follows: A. Field Act (Structural Repairs). Sixteen reinforced concrete school buildings will be brought to Field Act specifications and, in addition, modernized to comply with current building codes. Some
alterations to these buildings will bring them into conformance with educational standards of contemporary school construction.

1. These schools are:
   - Alamo
   - Alvarado
   - Dudley Stone
   - Edison
   - Hawthorne
   - Sanchez
   - S. B. Cooper
   - Sherman
   - Jefferson Auditorium
   - Lafayette
   - Le Conte
   - John Muir
   - Paul Revere Annex
   - Raphael Weill
   - West Portal
   - Winfield Scott

The budget for these schools is $18,530,000, composed of the following:

- Field Act requirements .................................. $5,548,400
- Code compliance made mandatory by the foregoing .... 9,179,410
- Modernization ............................................. 3,802,190

2. Field Act Compliance with Minimum Modernization. Three wood frame buildings, Garfield, Corbett and Francis Scott Key Annex elementary schools, will be brought up to Field Act compliance at relatively low cost. In addition, ninety-three relocatable classrooms, presently in the possession of the School District, will be upgraded to comply with standards of the Field Act. The estimated budget to bring the three schools and the ninety-three relocatables into compliance, based on the Structural Engineer's report, is $840,000.

B. School Replacements. Eight wood frame and three concrete buildings will be replaced with modern educational buildings. It has been determined that the cost of rehabilitation of these schools is not economically feasible.

Two new schools will be built in the Mission to replace Bryant, Marshall and Marshall Annex. The new school buildings will emphasize large flexible areas for teaching. Educational resource centers and multi-purpose space will complement these teaching areas.

It is proposed that each new school building serve at least 600 students. The eleven schools proposed for replacement and the two new Mission schools are:

- Emerson
- Jackson
- Farragut
- George Peabody
- J. Serra
- Frank McCoppin
- Sunnyside
- Commodore Sloat
- McKinley
- Monroe
- Sheridan
- 2 Mission schools + sites

The budget for these schools is $28,810,000.

C. Relocatable Classrooms. In order to minimize double sessions, 400 relocatable classrooms will be purchased to house students who will be displaced during the reconstruction period. Subsequent use of these classrooms will be determined from a series of options. Some options are to house displaced secondary school students, the development of relocatable schools, or sale as surplus property. The budget for purchase and erection on site of the 400 relocatable classrooms is $8,000,000.
This plan will provide "Quake-Safe" classrooms for all elementary school children by the 1973 deadline and, in addition, modernization as hereinabove described.

Endorsed by:

Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco
Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer
Most Rev. Joseph T. McGucken, Archbishop of San Francisco
Hon. Milton Marks, Senator
Elmer E. Botsai, President, Northern California Chapter, American Institute of Architects
Lee S. Dolson, President, San Francisco Classroom Teachers' Association
Joseph J. Diviny, Vice President, Teamsters International
Elwood B. Lang, President, Association of School Administrators
Kathryn S. Blalock, President, League of Women Voters
James Ballard, President, San Francisco Federation of Teachers
Mark W. Buell, Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Education Committee

Mrs. A. Elgin Heinz, President, Second District, P.T.A.
Zuretti L. Goosby, President, Board of Education
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., Vice President, Board of Education
Alan H. Nichols, Commissioner of Education
Howard Nemerovski, Commissioner of Education
John F. Crowley, Commissioner of Education
Claire Lillienthal, Commissioner of Education
Laurel E. Glass, Ph.D., Commissioner of Education
William A. Kellar, Area Director, S. F. Redevelopment Agency
C. R. Johnson, President, Laborers Local No. 261
Rabbi Alvin I. Fine
William Becker, Director, Human Rights Commission
Harold Zellerbach, President, San Francisco Art Commission
Very Rev. C. Julian Bartlett, Dean, Grace Episcopal Church
Rabbi Saul E. White, Cog. Beth Sholom
Charles de Limur
Harold S. Dobbs
Ruth Kadish
Donald L. Kuhn
Cyril Magnin
Lucille S. Abrahamson, President, S. F. Educational Auxiliary
Gordon J. Lau
Louis S. Simon, Area Vice President, KPIX-TV
Peter Boudoures, Secretary, Board of Permit Appeals
William H. Chester, Vice President, ILWU
Hon. Willie L. Brown, Jr., Assemblyman
Hon. John L. Burton, Assemblyman
John H. Dills
Richard L. Swig
Fabio de la Torres, Director, Centro Latino
Alfred A. Figone, District Council of Carpenters
Keith Eickman, Secretary-Treasurer, Warehouse Local No. 6
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Rev. Douglas L. Siden, President, San Francisco Council of Churches
Daniel F. Del Carlo, Secretary-Treasurer, S. F. Building and Construction Trades Council
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

An important question:
Is earthquake-proofing the schools the best way to save children from earthquakes, assuming San Francisco wants to spend $56,180,000 for that purpose?

The answer is, “No,” because there is only one chance in eight that any child will even be in a school if an earthquake occurs, as children spend 88% of their time at home or elsewhere than in the schools.

Save More Lives With Same Money

More school children's lives could thus be saved by spending the same money subsidizing the earthquake-proofing of children’s homes or enforcing the existing law against dangerous parapets that would fall into the streets at the time of an earthquake. These alternative uses of the same $56,180,000 could not only save more school children's lives but could save parents and pre-school children as well.

It is argued that schools must be torn down and rebuilt because the State Legislature of 1935 so ordered. But what was ordered by that Legislature can be changed by the current Legislature, if the cities involved make the request.

Too many good programs in education, job creation, housing, etc. have been lost to San Francisco because of lack of funds for $56,180,000 to be spent on earthquake protection which is a gamble against 8 to 1 odds that if an earthquake comes, the best place to protect children would be in the schools.

If San Franciscans do want to spend $56,180,000 on earthquake protection, the money should at least be spent in the way that is most likely to save the most lives. Demand that the alternatives be explored and that the best use of the money be determined before so large a sum is spent. Vote No on this illogical use of the money.

Paul Sack
A Citizen for Responsible Spending
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “A”
$56,180,000 for Public School Construction
Vote No on Proposition “A”

1. No definitive and detailed outline as to the use of the $56,180,000 Bond Issue has been given the voters.

2. We would be supporting this bond issue if it were dedicated exclusively to financing work necessary to meet the requirements of the Field Act and “Quake proof” schools and classrooms.

3. To the extent that partial definition has been given, it would appear that a substantial portion of the Bond Issue proceeds is to be expended for purposes other than “Quake Safing” schools and classrooms.

4. These outside purposes appear to include such things as upgrading educational facilities and maintenance. Maintenance by law or good practice should have been provided for out of the annual School District Budget, and not from Bond money.

5. Further, we are not in favor of any expenditures from this Bond Issue being made for facilities which would render increased busing potentially necessary now, or in the future; nor for facilities which would alter the pattern of neighborhood schools as now existing.

6. Last year we asked the School Board for a Master Plan of Education which would include New School Construction, Earth Quake Safety, and Up-dated Curriculum. No such master plan has been presented to the people.

7. Enrollment projections indicate a drop in school enrollment for the coming year with no evidence this drop will not continue. This would tend to show the $21,670,000 for new school construction to be excessive.

8. This $56,180,000 is only for elementary schools . . . what about Quake Safing the Junior High Schools and the Senior High Schools?

9. Approximately $11,000,000 of the $56,180,000 by the School Board’s own figures have no relation to Quake Safe schools.

10. The $56,180,000 does not include equipping the schools. Equipment for the schools will be over and above the $56,180,000.

11. No assurance has been given the voters that the bond money will be used exclusively for Quake Safe Schools.

12. This Bond Proposition has been improperly presented to the voters and should be separated into its components, namely Quake Proofing the Schools . . . New Construction . . . and Educational Innovation, thereby giving the people an opportunity to vote on each portion of the $56,180,000.
13. With the schools presently operating only 180 days per year, taxpayers may well ask why new schools should be built while present facilities are being used only half the year.

Vote No on Proposition "A"

By:
Marina Civic Improvement & Property Owners Association, Inc. and
The West of Twin Peaks Central Council,
representing 17 Home Owners Organizations.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183, SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 2.37 AND STATE ELECTIONS CODE SECTION 5301
PROPOSITION "A"

PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $56,180,000 for the improvement of the public schools in the City and County of San Francisco, including additions to and reconstruction, replacement, alteration and improvement of existing school buildings and educational facilities.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a twenty year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1971-1972 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be as follows:

| Bond redemption | $56,180,000 |
| Bond interest | $33,919,000 |
| Total debt service requirement | $90,099,000 |

Based on a five year construction program, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would be approximately $3,754,125 annually for twenty-four years, which amount is equivalent to sixteen and nine hundredths (16.09) cents in the tax rate.

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

The average dollar amount of the above estimated effect on the tax rate would be the equivalent of a cost to the owners of real property of $5,000, $8,750 and $12,500 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced by $750 Homeowner's Exemption</td>
<td>Not Reduced by Homeowner's Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Based on consideration of interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1971-1972 assessment roll, it is estimated that the tax rate required to be levied to fund the proposed bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of bonds would be
five and eighteen hundredths (5.18) cents. Based on five sales to com-
plete the issue it is estimated that twenty-four and fifty hundredths
(24.50) cents would be the highest rate required during the twenty-
four year redemption period to fund the proposed bond issue, which
rate is estimated to occur during the fiscal year 1976-1977.
NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION B

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $34,000,000 for the im-
provement of the Harbor of the City and County of San Francisco and its facilities.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “B”

Our Port Is A Gold Mine . . .
But Somebody Else May Get the Ore
(Unless we vote Yes on “B”—the Port Bond Issue on the Novem-
ber 2 Ballot)

The Port of San Francisco is one of the world’s “quality” ports, the finest, busiest port on the Pacific Coast. It has always paid its own way.

It is the City’s biggest single business . . . creator, directly and indirectly, of 67,000 jobs and $500,000,000 in payrolls and business income annually.

It’s a gold mine we can make even more productive if we vote Yes on “B”, the $34,000,000 Port Bond Issue to fund construction of Pier 94 . . . a new-era terminal capable of handling the containerized cargoes of the bigger new breed of vessels the world’s shipping lines are now using.

Never Any Taxes for the Port—None for Proposition “B”

*The bond issue is a carefully planned investment. No bonds will be sold until the City is assured the rentals and cargo revenues at Pier 94 will pay them off. Pier 94’s great contribution to the City’s economy will be gained without any cost to the taxpayers.

If We Don’t Vote Yes We Might as Well Close the Mine

Without construction of Pier 94, San Francisco not only would not get some 1,000,000 new tons of cargo annually—adding $250,-
000,000 a year to the value of our ocean trade, and providing some 2800 new waterfront-oriented jobs—we would lose much of what the port now produces.

*Shipping lines must have the new type of pier to handle their new ships and cargo containers. If we don’t offer the facilities, the lines will be forced to go instead to Los Angeles or Seattle.

*There is no other place in the Bay Area where such a pier can be built.

Pier 94—Next Step in Master Plan for a Great Port

In 1968 San Francisco voted to take back its port from state con-
trol, as a vital necessity to the City’s economic future. To realize
our determination to create a great, totally modern port a 25-year master plan was carefully worked out and put into action.

*The big Army Street terminal and the unique LASH terminal (to open next January) are among the early achievements of that plan.*

*Pier 94 is the next big step. It will take us more than half way to completion of our plan for a great golden port south of the Ferry Building. Importantly, in this understandable era of environmental and conservationist concern for the heritage about us, The Bay Conservation and Development Commission has approved the Pier 94 project.*

**Keep Our Gold Mine Working—Vote Yes on Proposition “B”.**

Endorsed by:

Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco
Hon. John L. Burton, Assemblyman, 20th District
Elmer E. Robinson, Judge of the Superior Court (Ret.)
Cyril Magnin, President, San Francisco Port Commission
Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer
Alan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning
Louis W. Niggeman, President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Frank D. Winston, President, San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
Stanley Sinton, Jr., President, D. N. & E. Walter & Co.
Downtown Association of San Francisco
Retail Dry Goods Association
Joseph Belardi, Secretary, Local Joint Executive Board of Culinary Workers
Harry Bridges, President, ILWU
Will H. Chester, Vice President, ILWU
Civil Service Association of San Francisco
Al Clem, Business Manager, Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3
L. B. DeLaney, President, Transport Workers Union 250A
Joseph J. Diviny, International Vice President, International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union
Paul Edgecombe, President, Operating Engineers No. 3
Franz E. Glen, Business Manager, IDSEW 6
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Harry Jorgensen, President, Marine Firemen’s Union
Joseph P. Mazzola, Business Manager-Financial Secretary, Plumbers & Steamfitters No. 38
Robert Rønhat, President, ILWU, Local 10
Rudy Tham, Secretary-Treasurer, Teamsters Local 856
Edward Turner, Secretary-Treasurer, Marine Cooks & Stewards
Morris Weisberger, Secretary-Treasurer, Sailors’ Union of the Pacific;
President, S. F. Maritime Trades Port Council
Harold Dobbs, Attorney
George Y. Chinn, Commissioner, Board of Permit Appeals
J. C. Gertsch, President, Central Council of Civic Clubs
Russell R. Miller, Vice President, Brennan Financial Group
Michael S. Salerno, Past President, Irving Street Merchants Association
Ruth Church Gupta, Past President, S. F. Council of District Merchants Association
Richard B. Gibbons, Vice President, Miraloma Park Improvement Club
George L. Bedford, President, Baptist Ministers Union
Angelo Rolando, President, Sunset-Parkside Business Men and Women’s Political Association
E. C. Ayala
San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote: Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "B"

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $34,000,000 for the improvement of the Harbor of the City and County of San Francisco and its facilities.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond interest</td>
<td>32,919,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$66,919,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a three year construction program and a bond redemption schedule beginning five years after sale of each issue, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would be approximately $2,091,219 annually for thirty-two years.

In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Port revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION C

HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $3,850,000 for additions to and alteration and reconstruction of a portion of the Hall of Justice Building to provide additional courtrooms and related rooms for the Superior and Municipal Courts.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "C"

Proposition "C" provides for the construction of additional courtrooms at the Hall of Justice by adding a second and third floor above the Coroner's Office.

The passage of Proposition "C" will remove the trial of criminal cases from the City Hall. Four full time Superior Courts and two full time Municipal Courts are utilized at present at City Hall for the trial of criminal cases. Proposition "C" will eliminate this extremely dangerous practice. Some of the felony trials of necessity involve defendants in custody who are brought handcuffed.

The security at City Hall is poor. There are no holding cells for custody of defendants, nor are there private elevators or corridors to bring defendants to court. During recess and lunch, defendants are kept in jury deliberation rooms, when available, requiring constant surveillance by bailiffs and deputy sheriffs. Transportation of defendants from the Hall of Justice to the City Hall places an un-
due burden and risk on the Sheriff's Office as well as the balliffs assigned to the criminal departments, since they must be away from their departments either bringing prisoners to the City Hall or returning them to the Hall of Justice.

Earlier this year, an attempt was made to smuggle a loaded gun to a defendant in custody, by a co-defendant who was on bail, so that he could escape from the courtroom.

Felony filings in the last 10 years have increased more than 150 per cent, which made it necessary to devote four full time Superior Court rooms at City Hall to criminal cases.

Proposition "C" will make it safe for citizens who have business at the various City departments in the City Hall to go there without fear of injury.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco
Hon. Francis McCarty, Presiding Judge of Superior Court
Hon. Gerald J. O'Gara, Presiding Judge of Municipal Court
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 183,
SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 2.37
AND STATE ELECTIONS CODE SECTION 5301
PROPOSITION "C"

HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $3,850,000 for additions to and alteration and reconstruction of a portion of the Hall of Justice Building to provide additional courtrooms and related rooms for the Superior and Municipal Courts.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1971-1972 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be as follows:

Bond redemption .................................. $3,850,000
Bond interest .................................... 1,693,000
Total debt service requirement ................. $5,543,000

Based on a three year construction program, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof, would be approximately $326,059 for seventeen years which amount is equivalent to one and forty hundredths (1.40) cent in the tax rate.

Upon completion of the new two-story addition, there would be an increase in operation and maintenance costs estimated at $35,000 annually. This amount is equivalent to fifteen hundredths (.15) cent in the tax rate.
Estimated average annual cost including debt service and maintenance for the fourth and successive years is estimated at $361,059. The total increase after completion of construction is equivalent to one and fifty-five hundredths (1.55) cent in the tax rate.

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

The average dollar amount of the above estimated effect on the tax rate would be the equivalent of a cost to the owners of real property of $5,000, $8,750 and $12,500 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Assessed Value Reduced by $750</th>
<th>Assessed Value Not Reduced by Homeowner's Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$.66</td>
<td>$.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Based on consideration of interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1971-1972 assessment roll, it is estimated that the tax rate required to be levied to fund the proposed bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of bonds would be twenty hundredths (.20) of one cent. Based on three sales to complete the issue, it is estimated that one and ninety-seven hundredths (1.97) cent would be the highest rate required during the seventeen year redemption period to fund the proposed bond issue, which rate is estimated to occur during the fiscal year 1974-1975.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

**PROPOSITION D**

**FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $8,491,000 for additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco.**

**ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “D”**

The San Francisco Fire Department is internationally recognized for its fire-fighting ability, its efficiency and its modern approach to its assigned task of protecting the lives and property of those who live and work in our City.

For many years, San Francisco has enjoyed a Class Two fire insurance rating (the highest issued) from the American Insurance Association, indicating the high overall caliber of the San Francisco Fire Department.

However, in the last rating report, made in 1966, San Francisco was dangerously close to dropping out of the Class Two category, down to a Class Three rating. A Class Two category covers cities charged with between 500 and 1,000 deficiency points on the Associ-
ation's grading schedule; in the 1966 rating, San Francisco was within 15 points of Class Three.

This 15-point margin is much too slim, and continued deterioration of the rating would mean a change of category at a tremendous cost in increased insurance premiums for San Francisco residents and businessmen.

San Francisco's high Class Two rating can be maintained, and the deficiency points reduced through improvements in the City's Fire Protection Systems and Equipment. The $8,491,000 bond issue, Proposition "D", will provide these improvements in every section of San Francisco.

Proposition "D" will provide fire-protection facilities for both the San Francisco neighborhoods and the downtown areas.

Proposition "D" will mean a saving to every San Francisco home owner, renter and businessman, because they will pay more in insurance premiums if San Francisco is rated as a Class Three city than they pay now with our Class Two rating.

The home owner, renter or businessman will save three cents in insurance premiums for every two cents that Proposition "D" will add to the tax roll each year.

Proposition "D" means money saved on insurance premiums.

Proposition "D" means better protection against the effects of fire, earthquake or any other disaster.

**Vote for Proposition "D"**

Save Money on Insurance Premiums—Protect San Francisco

Proposition "D" will improve San Francisco's high pressure water supply system throughout our City, including the Marina, Mission, Western Addition, Hunters Point and India Basin, Noe Valley, Eureka Valley, Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, Chinatown, North Beach, Bay View and other neighborhoods.

Proposition "D" will improve the low pressure water distribution system in the Sunset District of San Francisco.

Proposition "D" will provide better access to Stow Lake's water supply if needed for emergencies in the Richmond District.

Proposition "D" will provide funds for the purchase of new, modern equipment such as pumper's, aerial ladder trucks, a second fireboat and other vital fire-fighting apparatus, and will replace the water towers that have been in service since 1906 with modern snorkles.

Proposition "D" will provide a modern, electronic command and control system to replace the current system which was installed in 1915 and which has not been basically changed in the past 56 years. When the current system was installed, the San Francisco Fire Department received 1,275 alarms a year. Last year, the San Francisco Fire Department responded to 33,619 alarms, an increase of 2,000 per cent.

**Protect Your Pocketbook and Your City—Vote Yes on "D"**

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco
Elmer E. Robinson, Judge of the Superior Court (Ret.)
George Christopher
John F. Shelley, Legislative Representative
Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer
Frank L. Alioto, President, Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, Member, Fire Commission
Rudy Tham, Vice President, Fire Commission
Keith P. Calden, Chief of Fire Department
Evelyn A. Cox
Daniel Del Carlo
Hon. John A. Ertola, Judge of the Superior Court
Irwin Phillips
Hon. Phillip Burton, Congressman
Hon. George P. Reilly, Member, California State Board of Equalization
Hon. Milton Marks, Senator
Hon. George Moscone, Senator
Hon. John Burton, Assemblyman
Hon. Willie L. Brown, Jr., Assemblyman
Hon. John Francis Foran, Assemblyman
Hon. Leo T. McCarthy, Assemblyman
Hap Hazard, Richmond District
Eddie Jung, Richmond District
William Marsico
Frank I. Minahan
Yori Wada, Civil Service Commissioner
Marguerite A. Warren
H. K. Wong
San Francisco Fire Fighters, Local 798
San Francisco Fire Chiefs Association
Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Clement Street Merchants
Noriega Merchants Association
San Francisco Council of District Merchants
San Francisco Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.
Plumbing & Mechanical Contractors of San Francisco, Inc.
San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Joint ILWU
Teamsters' Joint Council No. 7
Municipal Improvement League
Civil Service Association
Professional and Technical Engineers Association, Local No. 17
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183,
SAN FRANCISCO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 2.37
AND STATE ELECTIONS CODE SECTION 5301
PROPOSITION "D"

Fire Protection Systems Improvement Bonds, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $8,491,000 for additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1971-1972 assessment roll as the basis for calculating the effect upon the tax rate, in my opinion, it is estimated that approximate costs would be as follows:

Bond Redemption .................................. $ 8,491,000
Bond Interest .................................... 3,732,000
Total Debt Service Requirement .................. $12,223,000
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Based on a five year construction program, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof would be approximately $643,316 for nineteen years which amount is equivalent to two and seventy-six hundredths (2.76) cents in the tax rate.

Upon completion of the construction program, there will be a reduction in operation and maintenance costs in the amount of $180,000. This amount is equivalent to seventy-seven hundredths (.77) of one cent in the tax rate.

Estimated average annual cost for the 6th and successive years is estimated at $463,316. The net increase after completion of construction is equivalent to one and ninety-nine hundredths (1.99) cent in the tax rate.

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

The average dollar amount of the above estimated effect on the tax rate would be the equivalent of a cost to the owners of real property of $5,000, $8,750 and $12,500 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Assessed Value Reduced by $750</th>
<th>Assessed Value Not Reduced by Homeowner's Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ .85</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Based on consideration of interest rates related to current municipal bond sales and using the 1971-1972 assessment roll, it is estimated that the tax rate required to be levied to fund the proposed bond issue during the first fiscal year after the sale of bonds would be seventy-eight hundredths (.78) of one cent. Based on five sales to complete the issue, it is estimated that four and twelve hundredths (4.12) cents would be the highest rate required during the nineteen year redemption period to fund the proposed bond issue, which rate is estimated to occur during the fiscal year 1976-1977.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION E

Amends Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5, 35.5½ and 146, relating to organization and administration of Police Department and promotional examinations therein.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION E

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5, 35.5½,
and 146 thereof, relating to the organization and administration of the Police Department and promotional examinations therein.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5, 35.5½ and 146 thereof, to read as follows:

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

Departments Under Mayor
Police Department

Section 35. The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this charter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of three members, who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1,200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at twelve o'clock, noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948, respectively. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment shall continue to hold their respective positions, subject to the provisions of the charter, for the remainder of the terms for which they have been respectively appointed.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county at the time this amendment shall become effective, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as in this charter otherwise provided. They shall have the power ((to regulate traffic by means of police officers and the emergency use of temporary signs or devices)) and duty to organize, reorganize and manage the police department. They shall by rule and subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, have power to create new or additional ranks or positions in the department which shall be subject to the civil service provisions of the charter; provided that the police commission subject to the recommendation of the civil service commission and the approval of the board of supervisors may declare such new or additional ranks or positions to be exempt from the civil service provisions of the charter. If the civil service commission disapproves any such exemption, the board of supervisors may approve such exemptions by a majority vote of the members thereof. The police commission may in their discretion designate the rank or ranks from which appointments to such exempt ranks or positions shall be made. Appointments to any non-civil service rank or position above the rank of captain as may be created hereunder shall be designated only from the civil service rank of captain. If any new or additional rank or position is created pursuant hereto pending the adoption of salary standards for such rank or position, the police commission shall have power to recommend the basic rate of compensation therefor to the board of supervisors and said board of supervisors shall have the power to fix the rate of compensation for said new rank or position and it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget,
to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the basic rate of compensation fixed by said board of supervisors for said new rank or position for the then current fiscal year. Thereafter the compensation for said new rank or position shall be fixed as provided for in sections 35.5.1 and 35.5.2 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 36.3 of this charter relating to parity or compensation for police officers and firemen for the fourth year of service and thereafter. The police commission shall also have power to establish and from time to time change the order or rank of the non-civil service ranks in the police department.

The traffic (bureau) function of the police department (is hereby established) shall be under the jurisdiction of the chief of police, ((, The bureau shall be in charge of a traffic director,)) who shall have powers and duties relating to street traffic, subject to laws relating thereto ((and to the police commission,) as follows: (a) to regulate all street traffic by means of police officers and the emergency use of temporary signs or devices; (b) to promote traffic safety education and to receive and give prompt attention to complaints in relation to street traffic and to refer all complaints relating to or arising from street design or from traffic devices, or the absence thereof, to the department of public works; (c) to collect and compile traffic accident data, copies whereof shall be furnished to the department of public works; (d) to cooperate and advise for the best performance of these functions, with the department of public works, the public utilities commission, the fire department, the department of city planning, the board of supervisors and other departments and agencies of the city and county and state as may be necessary; and (e) to review all proposed plans relating to street traffic control devices which are received from the department of public works and to make such recommendations to that department as may be deemed necessary for the proper regulation of street traffic within fifteen (15) days after receipt of said plans from the department of public works, pursuant to Section 107.1 of this charter.

The powers and duties of the ((traffic director)) chief of police with respect to traffic functions hereinabove stated shall not modify to any extent the powers and duties of any department or office, but shall be, first for the purpose of assisting the ((police commission)) chief of police in ((its)) his regulation of traffic, and, second, for the purpose of recommendation only, to other departments or offices upon matters within their jurisdiction, but affecting to any extent the regulation of traffic.

The effective date of this section as amended herein shall be July 1, 1972.

Section 35.3. Assignment to the ranks of assistant inspector and inspector in the police department shall be made by the chief of police from among those members of said department holding the ranks of sergeant, police officer or woman protective officer, who have qualified in the following manner: any of the aforesaid members of the police department who has served in the department not less than three years shall be eligible to participate in a competitive examination for the rank of assistant inspector which shall
be administered by the civil service commission. Such competitive examination shall primarily pertain to matters concerning the duties of the classifications of assistant inspector and inspector. In addition to the written portion of this examination, participants shall be examined orally by a board composed of three (3) supervisory officers having investigatory experience from those police departments in cities other than San Francisco surveyed under section 35.5.1 of this charter, who shall be selected by the civil service commission. Rating of the examination shall be a composite of grades attained in the written examination, the oral examination, and a rating for seniority of service. The written examination shall be given a weight of 75% and the oral examination shall be given a weight of 20%, and seniority of service shall be given a weight of 5%. The civil service commission shall certify to the chief of police a list of certified candidates which shall not be less than the number of current and anticipated vacancies for a two-year period as determined by the chief of police plus twenty-five (25) per cent. Said list shall rank the candidates by order of the composite grade attained in the examination. Said list shall expire every two (2) years following adoption by the civil service commission. The chief of police shall appoint assistant inspectors to fill vacancies in the rank of assistant inspector from the certified list of qualified candidates by order of the grade achieved in the examination; provided, however, if any member of the department appointed as an assistant inspector is a sergeant at the time of the appointment or is appointed a sergeant thereafter, he shall receive the rate of compensation attached to the rank of sergeant.

(The chief of police may appoint members of the department holding ranks of police officer and sergeant to the rank of assistant inspector for performance of duty in the bureau of inspectors, the juvenile bureau, the accident investigation bureau, the bureau of special services, and the intelligence unit.) Assistant inspectors (and inspectors) shall serve at the pleasure of the chief of police during their first year of service as assistant inspector and thereafter may only be removed and returned to their civil service rank in the manner herein provided for inspectors) a six (6) month probationary period. (An appointment) Appointment as inspector (or as assistant inspector) shall not be subject to competitive examination. Each inspector shall serve at the pleasure of the chief of police during his first year of service and thereafter may only be removed and returned to his civil service rank in the manner herein provided. In case of vacancy in said rank of inspector (in the bureau of inspectors), the appointment shall be made by the chief of police from among those holding the rank of assistant inspector who have actually served (with the bureau of inspectors) as assistant inspector for at least two years prior to such appointment; provided, however, that in the event there are no assistant inspectors who have actually served as such for at least two years prior to such appointment, the appointment may be made by the chief of police from among those holding the rank of assistant inspector who have completed their six months probationary period prior to such appointment. (The chief of police may appoint inspectors in the juvenile bureau, the accident investigation bureau, the bureau of special services, and the intelligence unit; such ap-
pointments shall be made from among those holding the rank of assistant inspector who have actually served in the bureau or unit in which the appointment is made for at least two (2) years prior to such appointment. The number of inspectors at any one time in the juvenile bureau, the accident investigation bureau, the bureau of special services, and the intelligence unit shall not be greater than a total of twenty-five (25) inspectors.) The chief of police may, from time to time, detail members of the department for performance of duty, without change in rank, in the (bureau of inspectors, the juvenile bureau, the accident investigation bureau, the bureau of special services and the intelligence unit)) various units and bureaus of the department.

Inspectors and assistant inspectors shall have the same rights as other members of the department to take competitive examinations from their respective civil service ranks ((.)) ; provided, however, that any member of the department holding the rank of assistant inspector or police officer may take the competitive examination for the rank of sergeant. An inspector or assistant inspector guilty of any offense or violation of the rules and ((regulations)) procedures of the police department shall be subject to punishment as provided in section 155 of this charter; provided, however, that in addition to the punishments set forth in section 155, an inspector may be demoted to his civil service rank for any offense or violation set forth in said section and after trial and hearing before the police commission as set forth therein. ((The chief of police, in addition to the inspectors above provided for, shall detail any member of the department to serve as inspector of school traffic patrols who shall have rank and pay of inspector, subject to the provisions of this section.))

Members of the police department holding the rank of assistant inspector or inspector respectively on the effective date of this amendment shall be deemed appointed to such rank pursuant to the provisions of this section and thereafter shall hold such rank under such provisions.

Any police officer or sergeant assigned to the bureau of inspectors, the juvenile bureau, the hit and run detail of the traffic bureau, the bureau of special services, the narcotics bureau or the intelligence unit on the effective date of this amendment and who had been so assigned or detailed on or before August 2, 1971, shall be deemed appointed to the rank of assistant inspector pursuant to the provisions of this section and thereafter shall hold such rank under such provisions.

The board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance, and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1971-1972, to include the provisions necessary for the reclassification of the police officers and sergeants deemed appointed to the rank of assistant inspector herein and the payment of any additional compensation related thereto.

The effective date of this section as amended herein shall be the first day of the month following ratification.

Section 354. Subject to the provisions of section 20 of this charter governing the appointment and removal of non-civil service appointees, and without competitive examination, the chief of
police shall have power to appoint a police surgeon; ((to designate a deputy chief of police, a department secretary, and a director, bureau of special services, from any rank in the department; to designate a director of traffic from among the members of the police department holding rank of lieutenant or higher; to designate a chief of inspectors from among the members of the department holding the rank of captain; to designate a director, bureau of criminal information, from among the members of the department having the rank of sergeant or higher; to designate from among the members of the department holding rank of lieutenant or higher, a captain of inspectors, who shall be administrative assistant to the chief of inspectors, a captain of traffic, and a director, bureau of personnel; and to designate a supervisory captain of districts from among the members of the department holding the rank of captain;)) to appoint from among the members of the department holding the civil service rank of captain, a member to any non-civil service rank above the rank of captain as may be created by the police commission pursuant to the provisions of section 35 of this charter; and to appoint a member to any non-civil service rank below the rank of captain as may be created by the police commission pursuant to the provisions of section 35 from among the members of the department holding the rank or ranks designated by said commission pursuant to the provisions of section 35 of this charter. ((The department secretary or other suitable member of the department shall be assigned by the chief of police to serve also as secretary to the police commission without extra compensation. The chief of police shall assign a property clerk from among the members of the department, such assignment shall be made at the rank and pay of the member so assigned.))

When any member of the department, detailed to any of the positions above mentioned, shall be removed from said detail or position, he shall be returned to his civil service rank and position, unless removed from the department pursuant to the provisions of section 155 of the charter.

No appointment shall be made which would result in a member holding a lower civil service rank or position supervising a member holding a higher civil service rank or position; provided, however, that any member of the department holding a position on the effective date of this amendment whose civil service rank is lower than that specified for such position may be retained in such position subject to the provisions of section 20 of this charter, if he has held such position for at least one year prior to the effective date hereof.

The effective date of this section as amended herein shall be July 1, 1972.

Section 35.5. ((The police force of the city and county shall not exceed one police officer for each five hundred inhabitants thereof.)) The several ranks or positions in the department shall be as follows: chief of police, ((deputy chief of police, director of traffic, chief of inspectors, supervising captain of districts, department secretary, captain of inspectors, captain of traffic, director of bureau of personnel, director of bureau of criminal information,)) captains, criminologists, lieutenants, (director of bureau of special services,) inspectors, sergeants, assistant inspectors, (photographer,) police surgeon, police officers, police patrol drivers and
women protective officers ((.)) , and such other ranks or positions as the police commission may from time to time create as provided for in section 35 of this charter. The compensation for these ranks shall be determined as provided in sections 35, 35.5.1 and ((section)) 35.5.2 of this charter.

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

The absence of any police officer, woman protective officer, or police patrol driver on military leave, as defined by section 153 of this charter, shall be reckoned a part of his service under the city and county, for the purpose of computing years of service in gaining added compensation as provided for herein.

The effective date of this section as amended herein shall be July 1, 1972.

Section 35.5½. (a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members ((of the several ranks)) in the police department set forth in section 35.5 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in section 35.5 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the ((police commission)) chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the ((said police commission may authorize the)) chief of police ((to)) may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, members shall be compensated on the basis of straight time in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 35.5, or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in section ((151)) 151.4 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the ((police commission)) chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, the ((said commission)) chief of police may ((authorize the chief of police to)) permit said member to serve during said vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of straight time in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in section 35.5.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1, of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignment, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing subsections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of section 151 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of straight time as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay in the judgment of the police commission.

((i)) ((This section shall become effective on the first day of the month immediately following the date of ratification.))

Promotions

Section 146. Except as specifically provided for herein, (W) whenever it deems it to be practicable, the civil service commission shall provide for promotion in the service on the basis of such examinations and tests as the commission may deem appropriate, and shall, in addition, give consideration to ascertained merit and records of city and county service of applicants. The commission shall announce in the examination scope circular the next lower rank or ranks from which the promotion will be made. Except as specifically provided in other sections of this charter, all promotions in the uniform forces of the police and fire departments, respectively, shall be made from the next lower civil service rank attained by examinations, as herein set forth, giving consideration also to meritorious public service and seniority of service and a clean record in the respective departments(), and all () promotive examinations in () the police and fire) said departments shall be entirely of a written character, and all questions asked or problems given in said examinations shall pertain to matters concerning the duties of (members of the department) the position or rank for which the examination is held.

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

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

(a) For Promotion to the Rank of Sergeant of Police:
One per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the department until a total of fifteen per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached;

(b) For Promotion to the Rank of Lieutenant of Police:
Six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the department until a total of nine per cent of said total credits of the entire examination is reached, and in addition thereto six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the rank of corporal or sergeant until a total of six per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

(c) For Promotion to the Rank of Captain of Police:
Forty-five hundredths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the department until a total of nine per cent of said total credits for said examination is reached, and in addition thereto six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the rank of lieutenant until a total of six per cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

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

Examination for Eligibles for the Fire Department

Fifteen per cent of the total credits allowed for any promotive examination shall be allowed for seniority of service, which said credits shall be distributed as follows:

(e) For Promotion to the Rank of Lieutenant in the Fire Department:
One per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a maximum of fifteen per cent is reached;

(f) For Promotion to the Rank of Captain in the Fire Department:
Six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service in the fire department until a total of nine per cent is reached; and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examination for each year of
service in the rank of lieutenant until a total of six per cent of the
credits of the entire examination is reached.

(g) For Promotion to all Ranks Above Captain in the Fire De-
partment:

Forty-five hundredths of one per cent of the total credits allowed
for the entire examination shall be allowed for each year of service
in the fire department until a total of nine per cent of said credits
is reached, and in addition thereto there shall be allowed six-tenths
of one per cent of the total credits allowed for the entire examina-
tion for each year of service as an officer in the rank held by the
applicant at the time of the examination, until a total of six per
cent of the credits of the entire examination is reached.

(h) In addition to the foregoing credits for seniority six per
cent of the total credits allowed for said examinations, shall be
allowed to each applicant for a clean record in the department.

(i) In promotional examinations in the police and fire depart-
ments, seniority of service and a clean record in the respective de-
partments shall be added to the credit obtained by the applicant in
the written portion of said examination, and shall be taken into
consideration by the commission in determining his passing mark
and his place upon the list of eligibles.

(j) In computing the credits for service in both the police de-
partment and the fire department, fractional parts of the year shall
not be considered.

The effective date of this section as amended herein shall be the
first day of the month following ratification.

Ordered submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales,
Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was
ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “E”

A “Yes” vote on Proposition “E” will enable the Police Commis-
sion, with the approval of the Civil Service Commission and the
Board of Supervisors, to reorganize the Police Department. Re-
organization is many years overdue. No longer can your Police
Department function effectively under the present archaic admin-
nistrative setup required by present Charter provisions. The demands
made on the Police Department are constantly changing and the
Department must be able to change to meet those demands.

A “Yes” vote on Proposition “E” will provide for the assignment
of officers to the important investigative positions as the result of
demonstrated merit in competitive civil service examinations.

A “Yes” vote on Proposition “E” will provide that promotional
examinations for members of the Police Department must pertain
to the duties of the position. This means that officers to be pro-
moted must demonstrate their qualifications for the increased re-
sponsibility of higher rank.

A “Yes” vote on Proposition “E” will benefit the citizens of San
Francisco by providing better and more efficient law enforcement.
VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION "E"

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Civil Service Association of San Francisco
Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Joseph J. Diviny, International Brotherhood of Teamsters
Municipal Improvement League, consisting of:
American Federation of Technical Engineers Local 17
Automotive Machinists Lodge No. 1305
Civil Service Association of San Francisco
Civil Service Building Maintenance Union Local 66A
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Association of San Francisco
Cooks, Pastry Cooks & Assistants Local 44
Deputy Sheriffs’ Association Inc. of San Francisco
Hospital & Institutional Workers’ Union Local 250
International Union of Operating Engineers Stationary Local 39
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco City and County Employees Union Local 400
San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
San Francisco Federation of Teachers Local 61
San Francisco City and County Employees Local 747
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 708
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association Inc.
Staff Council Bureau of Public Health Nursing
Elmo E. Ferrari, President, Police Commission
Washington E. Garner, M.D., Member, Police Commission
Richard K. Miller, Member, Police Commission
Alfred J. Nelder, Chief of Police
San Francisco Police Officers Association
San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Robert O. Hage, Teamsters Local 85

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.
ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “E”

This proposition is merely a rehashing of previous propositions submitted to the voters and turned down. This proposition will create a more top heavy bureaucracy, of which the police department is now overburdened with, and will do nothing for the policeman who fights crime in the street and who protects your homes and places of business, the men you call when you need help.

The question of appointment or promotion to the Inspectors Bureau is a moot one. We now have one of the most highly rated Inspectors Bureau in the United States and there is absolutely no guarantee, nor can there be, that there will be any improvement if this proposition passes.

Proposition “E” will not put more policemen on the street for your protection.

Vote No on Proposition “E” and save your dollars, your business and maybe your life.

Henry Strong
Sergeant of Police.
Member of S. F. Police Officers Association
83
CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “F”

Amends Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5, 35.5½ and 146, relating to orga-
nization and administration of Police Department and promotional
examinations therein.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opin-
on, based on a report by the Police Department, the net annual
increase in the cost of government is estimated to be $98,000. Based
on the 1971-1972 assessment roll, this estimated annual increase is
equivalent to forty-two hundredths (.42) of one cent in the tax rate.

Other costs cannot be estimated until such time as the reorgan-
ization takes place.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION F

Adds Section 12.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to
appoint and remove a budget analyst and to pre-
scribe the duties thereof.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION F

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors
of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of
said city and county by adding Section 12.1 thereto, relating to the
Budget Analyst for the Board of Supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county
at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to
amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 12.1
thereto, so that the same shall read as follows:

BUDGET ANALYST

Section 12.1. Notwithstanding any other provisions or limita-
tions of this charter, the board of supervisors may appoint, and at
its pleasure may remove, a budget analyst, who shall have such
duties and responsibilities as the board shall prescribe.

Ordered submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, April
12, 1971.

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Fran-
cois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was or-
dered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “F”

The final budget for the City and County of San Francisco, ex-
clusive of school funds, for fiscal year 1971-72 amounts to $559,
A thorough, expert, independent analysis of such a budget is mandatory in order to insure that the various City and County departments are operating in the most efficient, effective, and economical manner.

In this regard, the Board of Supervisors appointed a Budget Analyst on March 15, 1971. The present Budget Analyst obtained his Certified Public Accountant certificate in the State of California, and has had extensive budgetary experience throughout his eleven previous years of professional work experience before being appointed to his present position. This experience included four years with the United States General Accounting Office, and four and one-half years with the City of Los Angeles under the City Administrative Officer.

Since his appointment, the Budget Analyst has demonstrated not only his ability to obtain facts and to make recommendations which have led to significant budget reductions, but also his independence in reporting facts to the Board of Supervisors.

Subsequent to nationwide recruitment efforts, the present Budget Analyst was selected from a competitive group of seventy-four candidates who applied for the position. The Board selected the person they believed was the most qualified for the job using the same objectives of a civil service selection process.

The Board needs an individual who will not in any way be influenced by relationships or ties with key departmental employees and an individual who will report facts in an objective manner, in confidence if and when required. Further, the Board recognizes that it must possess complete freedom in selecting a candidate if he is to be relied upon to maintain an independence in his reporting of the facts.

Sponsored by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “F”
Vote “No” on Proposition “F”

On November 7, 1987, the voters of San Francisco soundly defeated this very same proposition. And now, four years later, the proponents of the “Spoils System” in local government are at it again. Proposition “F” deserves the same fate as the 1967 proposition.

The Budget Analyst position has been created already and the current incumbent of the position has been appointed under civil service provisions of the City Charter. Why now, at this late date, should the position be removed from civil service and placed in the political arena?

The answer is clear: It is an attempt to apply the old patronage
game. The members of the Board of Supervisors are elected public officials. Their terms of office are limited and their length of service is conditional. On the other hand, a civil service appointee provides continuity of service to the public, without being subject to political pressures from elected legislators.

Job appointments should be kept out of the arena of politics. Our Civil Service Merit System is a bulwark against the "Spoils System." It is the public's only source of protection against patronage in public service.

Don't open the door to a widespread raid on the Merit System. Protect San Francisco's outstanding civil service system.

Vote "No" on Proposition "F".

This argument is sponsored by the Civil Service Association of San Francisco, Granville M. DeMerritt, Executive Secretary.

Granville M. DeMerritt

PROPOSITION G

Amends Section 156.2: Permits disability transferee to participate in promotional examinations after five years service in such position.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION G

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 156.2 thereof, relating to promotional examinations for disability transferees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 156.2 thereof, to read as follows:

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

SECTION 156.2. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 156 or any other provisions of this charter, whenever any employee is transferred under the provisions of section 156 of this charter and has held such position for ((ten(10))) five (5) years, he shall be eligible to participate in any promotional examination in which his classification is designated as the next lower rank from which promotion will be made; provided that the disability of said employee is not of such nature as to interfere with the performance of the duties required in the promotive classification. The civil service commission shall make such determination after examination of the employee by a civil service examining physician.

The salary of an employee who is promoted as the result of participation in a promotional examination under the provisions of this section shall be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter.
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Gonzales, Mailliard, Pelosi, Tamaras.
I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “G”
Vote Yes on Proposition “G”

Proposition “G” will amend the charter to permit disabled employees to take promotive examinations after five (5) years’ service in a disability transfer position. Under current charter provisions, whenever a disabled employee transfers to a new position, that employee cannot participate in a promotive examination until he or she has served at least ten (10) years in a disability transfer position.

Proposition “G” would remove this serious inequity by providing that an employee may participate in a promotive examination after five (5) years’ service in a disability transfer position.

To be eligible to participate in a promotive examination after five (5) years’ service, the disabled employee must, however, satisfy two requirements: 1) The employee must be otherwise qualified for the promotive position, and 2) The employee must submit to a medical examination to certify that the employee’s disability would not interfere with the performance of the duties required in the promotive position.

These two requirements, plus the required five (5) years’ service as a disability transferee, afford the public and the disabled employees sufficient protection in determining the ability of the disabled employee to occupy a promotive position.

This is a fair and equitable proposal. Proposition “G” would give a small handful of disabled employees the opportunity to participate in promotive examinations and without cost to the taxpayers.

Vote Yes on Proposition “G”

This amendment is sponsored by the Civil Service Association of San Francisco, Granville M. DeMerritt, Executive Secretary.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Marine Engineers’ Beneficial Association, AFL-CIO
Municipal Improvement League, consisting of:
American Federation of Technical Engineers Local 17
Automotive Machinists Lodge No. 1305
Civil Service Association
Civil Service Building Maintenance Union Local 66A
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Association of San Francisco
Cooks, Pastry Cooks & Assistants Local 44
Deputy Sheriffs’ Association Inc. of San Francisco
Hospital & Institutional Workers’ Union Local 250
International Union of Operating Engineers Stationary Local 39
Retired Employees of the City & County of San Francisco
San Francisco City & County Employees Union Local 400
San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
San Francisco Federation of Teachers Local 61
San Francisco City & County Employees Local 747
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San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
San Francisco Police Officers' Association
San Francisco Veteran Police Officers' Association Inc.
Staff Council-Bureau of Public Health Nursing
Professional and Technical Engineers Association, Local No. 17
San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the fore-
going argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Fran-
cois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamars, von Beroldingen.
ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

PROPOSITION H

Amends Section 183: Permits Mayor, Board of Sup-
visors or four or more members thereof, to submit, 
without cost, arguments opposing any measure sub-
mitted to electors by Mayor, Board of Supervisors or 
four or more members thereof.

CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of 
the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said 
city and county by amending Section 183 thereof, relating to mea-
ures, arguments and statements of Controller relating to costs, to be 
mailed to voters.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county 
at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971 a proposal to 
amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 
183 thereof, to read as follows:

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

Measures, Arguments and Statements of Controller Relating to 
Costs, to Be Mailed to Voters

SECTION 183. Whenever any measure is required by this 
charter to be submitted to the voters of the city and county at any 
election, the registrar shall cause the measure or policy to be print-
ed on sheets measuring approximately six by nine inches, and shall 
mail the same with a sample ballot to each voter, at least five days 
prior to the election. This printed copy may be attached to any 
other matter required to be printed and mailed.

With or upon the sample ballot mailed to each voter prior to a 
recall election, there shall be transmitted the reasons for demanding 
the recall of the officer as set forth in the recall petition, printed in 
not more than three hundred words, and with or upon the same 
ballet the printed statement of the officer in not more than three 
hundred words justifying his course in office.
If the proposition be submitted to the registered voters upon an initiative, referendum or recall petition, the persons filing said petition shall have the right, upon deposit of an amount sufficient to defray the cost of printing as estimated by the registrar, to present to the registrar at any time not later than thirty-five days prior to said election, written arguments favoring their petition, and the registrar shall not accept arguments favoring said petition without the approval of those filing said petition; provided that, as to any proposition to be submitted to the voters at a special election in accordance with section 182 hereof, to be held within thirty-five days of the date of calling such election, such arguments may be presented to the registrar at any time twenty-five days prior to said election. If said proposition be submitted by the mayor or by the board of supervisors, or by one-third of the board of supervisors, they shall have a similar right, but without the making of such deposit, to present arguments. Should the mayor or four or more members of the board of supervisors desire to submit to the voters a negative argument concerning any proposition submitted by the mayor, the board of supervisors, or one-third of the board of supervisors, they shall have a similar right, but without the making of such deposit, to present such an argument. The board of supervisors may also in its discretion, by motion, grant to any proponents of propositions submitted by the board a similar right, which may be exercised, subject to the approval of such arguments by motion of the board and upon the making of such deposit. Any persons, committee or organization opposing the measure, policy, charter amendment, or recall placed before the voters may present, upon making a deposit as aforementioned, and in like manner and within the same time, written arguments opposing said proposition.

Said arguments shall not contain more than 1800 words, nor exceed four pages in length when printed. They shall be signed by the persons or the presiding or executive officials of the committee or organization presenting them. The registrar shall cause said arguments to be printed in a pamphlet approximately six by nine inches in size in one color of ink and in uniform style. They shall be arranged in numerical or alphabetical order according to the number or letter of the proposition to which they refer, and the affirmative in each case shall precede the negative. The registrar shall charge a uniform fee per page sufficient to cover the cost of printing said pamphlet, returning to depositors any excess of deposits. He shall mail one copy with the sample ballot to each voter.

Immediately after introduction in the board of supervisors, or filing with the clerk thereof, of any measure to be submitted to the voters, or of the filing of a petition of the voters for submission of any proposed amendment of the charter, in accordance with the provisions of Article XI, Section ((8)) 3, of the Constitution of California, the clerk of the board shall deliver a copy of such proposition to the controller. The controller shall thereupon determine whether, in his opinion, such proposition, if adopted, will increase the cost of government of the city and county or in any way affect its tax rate. The controller shall make a written statement thereon to the board of supervisors, analyzing such proposition as to its cost and effect upon the tax rate. Such statement shall be in form appropriate for mailing to the voters with a sample ballot. Upon
vote of submission of any such proposition, which, in the opinion of
the controller, will in any way affect the cost of government or the
tax rate and as to all propositions to create a bonded debt, the con-
troller shall transmit a copy of such statement in relation thereto
to the registrar of voters, who shall mail one copy thereof to each
voter with the sample ballot. In the pamphlet of arguments, the
position of the statement of the controller shall in each instance be
next in order after the negative argument.

Ordered submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, May
17, 1971.

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Fran-
cois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was or-
dered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County
of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “H”

There are several reasons why this proposed Charter amend-
ment should be passed by the voters of San Francisco. First, it
gives the voters the opportunity to see why Supervisors (who are
opposed to any particular Charter amendment) voted as they did.
The voters are entitled to know how their elected officials feel on
any given issue, and this proposed Charter amendment provides
them that opportunity. The second reason is by allowing the Mayor
or four Supervisors to place a negative argument on the ballot, the
voters can see arguments for and against a Charter proposal, decide
for themselves and vote intelligently, depending upon which argu-
ment they feel is more persuasive.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the fore-
going argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet
for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois,
Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “H”

Amends Section 183: Permits Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four
or more members thereof, to submit, without cost, arguments
opposing any measure submitted to electors by Mayor, Board of
Supervisors or four or more members thereof.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opin-
ion, based on a report by the Registrar of Voters, the increased cost
of this amendment is estimated to be $2,500 per election. Based on the
1971-1972 assessment roll, this estimated increase is equivalent to
eleven thousandths (.011) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
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PROPOSITION I

Amends Section 135: Provides that persons appointed to certain administrative positions in school department after July 1, 1971, shall be granted four year contracts in said positions.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 135 thereof, relating to being classified as a permanent employee in a position in the school department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971 a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 135 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows: NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Powers and Duties of Board of Education

Section 135. In addition to the powers conferred by the general laws of the state and other provisions of this charter, the board of education shall have power to establish and maintain such schools as are authorized by the laws of the state as the board may determine, and to change, modify, consolidate or discontinue the same as the public welfare may require.

The board shall also have power to employ such teachers and other persons as may be necessary to carry into effect its powers and duties; to fix, alter and approve their salaries and compensations, except as in this charter otherwise provided, and to withhold for good and sufficient cause the whole or any part of the wages, salary, or compensation of any person or persons employed as aforesaid; and to promote, transfer and dismiss teachers, but no teacher shall be dismissed from the department except for insubordination, immoral or unprofessional conduct, or evident unfitness for teaching. Appointment, promotion, assignment and transfer of deputy superintendents, principals, assistants, teachers and all other certificated employees shall be made by the board of education upon the recommendation of the superintendent of schools. All promotions of teachers shall be based solely on merit. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the board from removing teachers as provided in this charter and the laws of the state. Charges against teachers must be made in writing by the superintendent after investigation and shall be finally passed upon by the board after giving the accused teacher a fair and impartial hearing before said board.

All teachers ((, heads of departments, vice-principals, principals, supervisors and directors)) shall be classified as permanent
employees in their respective positions after they have been successfully employed in such positions in the school department for a probationary period of three years. All heads of departments, vice-principals, principals, supervisors and directors who are appointed prior to July 1, 1971 shall be classified as permanent employees in their respective positions after they have been successfully employed in such positions in the school department for a probationary period of three years. In the absence of any action to the contrary by the board of education at the end of the third year of such employment, the classification shall be considered as permanent. ((A deputy superintendent shall be classified as a permanent employee in such position in the school department in which he was permanently employed immediately prior to his appointment as deputy.)) All heads of departments, vice principals, principals, supervisors and directors who are appointed on or after July 1, 1971 or who are otherwise determined not to be permanent employees shall be employed pursuant to four year contracts with the board of education which contracts shall be subject to renewal based upon achieving and maintaining standards of performance, which standards of performance shall be governed by rules and regulations as promulgated by the board of education.

Non-teaching and non-technical positions, and positions not required by law to be filled by a person holding a teaching or other certificate as required by law, shall be employed under the civil service provisions of this charter and the compensations of such persons shall be fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of this charter.

The board of education shall have power to grant and to renew, and, for insubordination, immoral or unprofessional conduct or unfitness for teaching, to revoke teachers' certificates.

The board shall establish regulations subject to the approval of the controller for the disbursement of all moneys belonging to the school department or the school fund or funds, and to secure strict accountability in the expenditure thereof, and to provide for the prompt payment of all salaries due and allowed to officers, teachers, and other employees of the school department.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter to the contrary, the board of education of the San Francisco Unified School District may authorize payment of the annual compensation of certificated employees in twelve equal payments, the first such equal payment being made on or before the 5th day of August of each school year, and continuing each month thereafter until the full annual compensation shall be paid, provided that the last equal payment shall be made not later than the 5th day of July of the succeeding school year, and provided further that in the event that the certificated employee for any reason does not perform the full year of service, said certificated employee shall receive only such amount as is authorized by the school code of the State of California. In the event said certificated employee has been paid an amount greater than such employee is entitled to receive under the provisions of the school code of the State of California, said certificated employee shall be liable therefor and within thirty days after such excess payment said certificated employee shall reimburse the San Francisco Unified School District for the excess, and said certifi-
cated employee shall not be paid any of his retirement accumula-
tions or credits until the San Francisco Unified School District has
been reimbursed for the said excess.

The board shall, between the 1st and 21st days of May of each
year, adopt a schedule of salaries for the next ensuing fiscal year
for teachers and other employees of the school department. Com-
penations of non-teaching and non-technical employees shall be
fixed in accordance with the salary standardization provisions of
this charter.

Ordered submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, June
1, 1971.

Ayes: Supervisors Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Mendelsohn,
Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Gonzales, Mailliard.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was
ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and
County of San Francisco.

PHILIP P. ENGLER, Acting Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "I"

The purpose of this Amendment is to “phase out” Administrative
Tenure in the San Francisco public school system. San Francisco
is the only school District in the State of California which grants
tenure to its administrators. The Amendment would terminate the
granting of tenure to administrators appointed on or after July 1,
1971. It would substitute a system of four year contracts to be
renewed on the basis of individual performance, the standards to
be established by the District’s governing body. As a matter of
fairness, those who have already accrued rights under the section
would be protected, but no further persons would become “perma-
nent employees” in school administration. This Amendment would
not result in any taxes or other costs to the taxpayers of San
Francisco.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Henry Adams
Carlotta Asturias
Joseph Benard
Sue Bransten
Lucy Cannarozzi
George Carlinus
Alfred G. Cinelli
Reynold H. Colvin
Louis G. Conlan
Carlos V. Cornejo
Edmundo Jose Cota
Armond DeMartini
Adolfo de Urioste
Hillard Goldstein
Bernard S. Greendorfer
Herbert Greenhood, M.D.
Dorothy Joe
Elwood B. Lang
Raymond Lowe
Stephen L. Mana
Leon Markel
Frances M. McAteer
Thomas F. McDonough
Mrs. Robert A. Mendle
John P. Moscone
William J. O'Keefe  
Earl Raab  
San Francisco Labor Council  
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council  
Burl A. Toler  
Ellan H. Tom  
Elba I. Tuttle

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

**PROPOSITION J**

Adds Sections 35.5.1½ and 36.3.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to establish basic work week for Police Department and to provide for working benefits, premium pay differentials and educational incentive programs for members of Police and Fire Departments.

**CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION J**

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by adding Sections 35.5.1½ and 36.3.1 thereto relating to working conditions and premium pay differentials for members of the Police and Fire Departments.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by adding Sections 35.5.1½ and 36.3.1 thereto reading as follows:

Section 35.5.1½. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the charter, the board of supervisors shall have the power by ordinance to establish the basic week of service, not to exceed 40 hours, and provide for working or employee benefits and premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever for members of the police department. Such ordinance or ordinances may adjust working or employee benefits or premium pay differentials presently provided by charter, ordinance, rule, or regulation or may provide for additional or new benefits, including educational incentive programs or premium pay differentials; provided, however, that nothing in this section shall be construed to affect those charter provisions pertaining to retirement benefits for members of the police department and provided further that the basic rate of compensation for members of the police department as defined in section 35.5.1 of the charter shall continue to be fixed as provided in said section.

This section shall become effective on the first day of the month.
immediately following the date of ratification of this amendment by the state legislature.

Section 36.31. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the charter, the board of supervisors shall have the power by ordinance to establish and provide for working or employee benefits and premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever for members of the Fire Department. Such ordinance or ordinances may adjust working or employee benefits or premium pay differentials presently provided by charter, ordinance, rule, or regulation or may provide for additional or new benefits, including educational incentive programs or premium pay differentials; provided, however, that nothing in this section shall be construed to affect those charter provisions pertaining to retirement benefits for members of the fire department and provided further that the basic rate of compensation for members of the fire department as defined in section 36.2 of the charter shall continue to be fixed as provided in said section, nor shall anything in this section be construed to affect the charter provision requiring that all tours of duty established for officers and members assigned to the fire fighting companies, including the salvage corps, shall start at eight o'clock a.m.

This section shall become effective on the first day of the month immediately following the date of ratification of this amendment by the state legislature.


Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francos, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “J”

Vote Yes Proposition “J”

State law allows Firemen and Police Officers to negotiate work benefits. Proposition “J” places this obligation on your Board of Supervisors where it belongs.

Allows Firemen and Police Officers to meet and confer with your Board of Supervisors in good faith.

Vote Yes on Proposition “J” and allow your Board of Supervisors to handle these administrative matters, in order to eliminate further costly Charter amendments.

Show your Police Officers and Fire Fighters you support them.

Vote Yes Proposition “J”

Sponsored by Fire and Police Campaign Committee.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Civil Service Association of San Franciscu
Frank N. Alioto, President, Fire Commission
Rudy Thom, Vice President, Fire Commission,
Morris Bernstein, Member, Fire Commission
Keith P. Calden, Chief, Fire Department
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 85
Municipal Improvement League, consisting of:
American Federation of Technical Engineers Local 17
Automotive Machinists Lodge No. 1305
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “J”

Vote No on Prop. “J” Don’t Give the Board of Supervisors a Blank Check!

Prop. “J” authorizes the Supervisors to set fringe benefits for firemen and policemen. It is impossible to estimate the total future cost, but the Controller reports that, in his opinion, “J” would cost over $3,000,000 a year in taxes—equal to 13 cents in the tax rate.

Prop. “J” would permit the Supervisors to reduce the police workweek below 40 hours—without any vote of the electorate and at a tremendous cost.

Vote No on “J.”

Don’t make a political football out of police and fire benefits—that is just what “J” would do.

This argument sponsored by the following members of The San Francisco Municipal Conference.

Building Owners and Managers Assn. S.F. Real Estate Board
Down Town Association, S.F.

Lloyd E. Graybiel, Chairman

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION “J”

Adds Section 35.5.1 1/2 and 36.3.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to establish basic work week for Police Department and to provide for working benefits, premium pay differentials and educational incentive programs for members of Police and Fire Departments.
Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, based on current budget requirements, the annual increase in the cost of government would be approximately $3,105,141 and of this amount $3,039,445 would be required from property taxes. Based on the 1971-1972 assessment roll, this estimated annual increase of $3,039,445 is equivalent to thirteen and three hundredths (13.03) cents in the tax rate.

The above estimate of cost considers that the Board of Supervisors will provide the same rate of compensation for overtime and night differential as is now provided for other salaried employees.

The proposed amendment also provides that the Board of Supervisors may consider providing other benefits for members of the Police and Fire Departments. These provisions in themselves do not create any additional cost, but as a product of their application to future legislation, additional cost of government may be incurred which is not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION K

Amends Sections 176, 182 and 183, relating to time of elections, sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.

CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION K

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 176, 182 and 183 thereof, relating to the time of election and sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Sections 176, 182 and 183 thereof, to read as follows:

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

Material to Be Mailed to Voters

SECTION 176. The registrar shall, before each municipal election, cause to be printed in pamphlet form and mailed to each registered voter with the sample ballot, a copy of all statements of qualifications of candidates received by him, to be followed by the names and addresses and occupations of all sponsors of all officers to be voted for in said city and county.

The registrar shall cause ballots to be printed identical with the ballot to be used in each assembly district at the election and shall furnish copies of the same on application to registered voters at his office at least ((five days)) thirty days before the date fixed
for such election. With the copy of the ballot the registrar shall also furnish copies of all material required by this charter to be mailed to the voters prior to the election. Commencing thirty days before the date fixed for the election, the registrar shall mail to each voter entitled to vote at such election a copy of the ballot to be used in his district, and a copy of all material required by this charter to be mailed to the voters prior to the election, so that all said sample ballots and material shall have been mailed at least (eight days) ten days before said election. The rotation of names of candidates on ballots shall be as provided by general law.

Time of Election

SECTION 182. If the petition accompanying a proposed initiative measure, declaration of policy, or recall be signed by registered voters equal in number to fifteen per cent of the entire vote cast for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election and contains a request that said measure, policy or recall be submitted forthwith to a vote of the electorate at a special election, then the registrar shall forthwith call a special election, which shall be held at a date not less than sixty nor more than seventy-five days from the date of calling the same, at which said measure or policy, without alteration, or said recall shall be submitted to a vote of the electorate (unless within sixty days of a general or primary election, in which event it shall be submitted at such general or primary election). To avoid holding more than one special election within any six months, the date for holding the special election may be fixed later than seventy-five days, but at as early a date as practicable after the expiration of six months from the last special election. When it is legally possible to hold a special election under this section within six months prior to a general or primary election, said measure, policy or recall shall be submitted at such general or primary election unless the board of supervisors, by ordinance, direct that the measure, policy or recall be voted on at a special election prior thereto.

If the petition accompanying a proposed initiative measure or declaration of policy be signed by registered voters equal in number to ten per cent but less than fifteen per cent of the said entire vote, and such measure or policy is not required to be, or for any reason is not, submitted to a vote of the electorate at a special election, then such measure or (measures) policy, without alteration, shall be submitted by the registrar to a vote of the electorate at the next general state or municipal election or primary election that shall occur at any time after forty-five days from the date of the certificate of sufficiency attached to the petition accompanying such measure or policy unless the board of supervisors, by ordinance, direct that the measure or policy be voted on at a special election prior thereto.

Measures, Arguments and Statements of Controller Relating to Costs, to Be Mailed to Voters

SECTION 183. Whenever any measure is required by this charter to be submitted to the voters of the city and county at any election, the registrar shall cause the measure or policy to be printed on sheets measuring approximately six by nine inches, and shall mail the same with a sample ballot to each voter, at least five days
prior to the election. This printed copy may be attached to any other matter required to be printed and mailed.) and shall at least thirty days before the date fixed for such election furnish at his office a copy of same on application to registered voters together with a sample ballot and a copy of all other material required by this charter to be mailed to the voters prior to the election. The printed copy of the measure or policy may be attached to any other matter required to be printed and mailed. Commencing thirty days before the date fixed for the election, the registrar shall mail to each voter entitled to vote at such election a printed copy of the measure or policy, a sample ballot and a copy of all other material required by this charter to be mailed to the voters prior to the election, so that all said printed copies, sample ballots and other material shall have been mailed at least ten days before said election.

With or upon the sample ballot mailed to each voter prior to a recall election, there shall be transmitted the reasons for demanding the recall of the officer as set forth in the recall petition, printed in not more than three hundred words, and with or upon the same ballot the printed statement of the officer in not more than three hundred words justifying his course in office.

If the proposition be submitted to the registered voters upon an initiative, referendum or recall petition, the persons filing said petition shall have the right, upon deposit of an amount sufficient to defray the cost of printing as estimated by the registrar, to present to the registrar at any time not later than ((thirty-five days)) fifty days prior to said election, written arguments favoring their petition, and the registrar shall not accept arguments favoring said petition without the approval of those filing said petition(;) provided that, as to any proposition to be submitted to the voters at a special election in accordance with section 182 hereof, to be held within thirty-five days of the date of calling such election, such arguments may be presented to the registrar at any time twenty-five days prior to said election.)) If said proposition be submitted by the mayor or by the board of supervisors, or by one-third of the board of supervisors, they shall have a similar right, but without the making of such deposit, to present arguments. The board of supervisors may also in its discretion, by motion, grant to any proponents of propositions submitted by the board a similar right, which may be exercised, subject to the approval of such arguments by motion of the board and upon the making of such deposit. Any persons, committee or organization opposing the measure, policy, charter amendment, or recall placed before the voters may present, upon making a deposit as aforementioned, and in like manner ((and within the same time.)) at any time not later than forty-five days prior to said election, written arguments opposing said proposition.

 Said arguments shall not contain more than 1800 words, nor exceed four pages in length when printed. They shall be signed by the persons or the presiding or executive officials of the committee or organization presenting them. The registrar shall cause said arguments to be printed in a pamphlet approximately six by nine inches in size in one color of ink and in uniform style. They shall be arranged in numerical or alphabetical order according to the number or letter of the proposition to which they refer, and the affirmative in each case shall precede the negative. The registrar
shall charge a uniform fee per page sufficient to cover the cost of printing said pamphlet, returning to depositors any excess of deposits. He shall mail one copy with the sample ballot to each voter.

Immediately after introduction in the board of supervisors, or filing with the clerk thereof, of any measure to be submitted to the voters, or of the filing of a petition of the voters for submission of any proposed amendment of the charter, in accordance with the provisions ((of Article XI, Section 8.)) of the Constitution and statutes of California, the clerk of the board shall deliver a copy of such proposition to the controller. The controller shall thereupon determine whether, in his opinion, such proposition, if adopted, will increase the cost of government of the city and county or in any way affect its tax rate. The controller shall make a written statement thereon to the board of supervisors, analyzing such proposition as to its cost and effect upon the tax rate. Such statement shall be in form appropriate for mailing to the voters with a sample ballot. Upon vote of submission of any such proposition, which, in the opinion of the controller, will in any way affect the cost of government or the tax rate and as to all propositions to create a bonded debt, the controller shall transmit a copy of such statement in relation thereto to the registrar of voters, who shall mail one copy thereof to each voter with the sample ballot. In the pamphlet of arguments, the position of the statement of the controller shall in each instance be next in order after the negative argument.


Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “K”

Under existing provisions of the City Charter, voters’ pamphlets are not available to absentee voters prior to the time when they are eligible to cast their ballots. This means that those who wish to vote early must vote blind without the official information booklet describing candidates, amendments to the City Charter, and bond issues.

The Registrar of Voters stated, in part, in a recent letter:

"With a 35-day-prior-to-election limit to present arguments for and against initiative matters, or negative arguments against any proposition irrespective of origin, it is impossible to have voters’ pamphlets available prior to or at the commencement of absentee voting (29 days before election). With only two or three working days available, the impossibility of editing any argument, sending copy to the printer, subsequently checking the proofs, returning the material to the plant for the printing and binding of voters' pamphlets, is self-apparent.

"Under the charter, in the absence of the amendments recommended, it would be impossible to mail the voters' pamphlets containing the candidates’ statements of qualifications and the sample
ballots, earlier than eight days before an election. Assuming the proposed changes are approved, voters’ pamphlets would be available for absentee voters and mailing of the pamphlets and sample ballots could commence at a date not less than 10 days prior to the election.

“This proposed amendment also increases the minimum and maximum time within which to call a special election requested by an initiative petition. It is in accord with the general law on special elections (4011(b) Election Code). Such an amendment . . . would provide a workable time table within which the Registrar’s Office could function at maximum efficiency at a minimum cost.”

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K
Vote No on K—Protect Our Right to Use the Initiative

Proposition K undermines the right of citizens to gain redress of their grievances through an initiative petition and a special election. Proposition K, if passed, would keep us from using a special election to either repeal or amend a bad law or to recall an elected public official. Proposition K would make it much more difficult for citizens to initiate new laws that the mayor or supervisors were unwilling to consider.

Vote No on K—Preserve the Right to an Immediate Special Election

Under present law, citizens can demand a special election within thirty days of the date when they are certified as having enough signatures on an initiative petition. Proposition K, by amending the City Charter, would virtually eliminate special elections. If the initiative petition qualified for the ballot within six (6) months of a general election the voters would not be entitled to a special election even if the entire electorate had demanded one! Instead, the initiative would be buried in the next general election and voted upon after a six month delay. The essence of an initiative is the right to a special election at the time when citizen unrest and outrage demands attention through a popular vote. But under Proposition K only the Board of Supervisors can approve a special election. But it is only after the Supervisors have failed to respond to a crucial issue that the citizens have to use an initiative. Therefore, it is doubtful that the Supervisors would ever approve a special election.

Don’t Make Initiatives Harder Than They Are Now

In addition to making special elections almost impossible, Proposition K would make it harder to qualify a petition for general
elections. At present, a petition will qualify for the general ballot if it is signed by about 12,000 voters. Proposition K would raise this to about 24,000 voters. This would double the difficulty for any neighborhood or civic group. For a special election, a petitioning group would need 36,000 signatures instead of the present 24,000. Under restrictions that strict no recent initiative (even the high-rise initiative or the elected school board initiative) would have qualified for a special election. Vote No on K.

Proponents:

ALVIN DUSKIN
CHARLES STARBUCK

PROPOSITION L

Adds Section 136.1: Establishes a separate governing board for San Francisco Community College District and provides for election of members thereof.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION L

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to add Section 136.1 to the Charter of said city and county relating to the control and management of the San Francisco Community College District and to the election of members of the governing board of said district, subject to certain existing provisions of this charter.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to add Section 136.1 to the Charter of said city and county to read as follows:

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

Section 136.1. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 134 or of any other provisions of this charter, on and after August 8, 1972, the community college district of the city and county shall be under the control and management of a board of education, hereinafter referred to as the governing board of said district, composed of seven members who are not members of the board of education of the unified school district of the city and county and who shall be elected at large by vote of the electors as in this section provided and who shall be subject to recall, and to suspensions or removal in the same manner as elective officers, as provided by this charter. The compensation of each member shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month.

At a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 there shall be elected seven members of the governing board of the community college district of the city and
The term of each member shall be four years; provided, however, that the respective terms of office of the members first elected shall commence at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of August, 1972, and shall expire as follows: the respective terms of office of the four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1977; the respective terms of office of the three members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1975.

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

The superintendent of the community college district shall be the executive officer of the governing board. He shall be appointed by said board to serve for a term of four years at an annual salary to be fixed by the board. Otherwise the provisions of sections 135 and 136 of this charter apply to the community college district.


Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzalez, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "L"

By making provision for a separate Governing Board for the San Francisco Community College District, elected by the people, this Proposition "L" recognizes the importance of separate consideration of problems dealing with adult and community college education from those affecting Children in Grades k-12.

The Community College District is a large, growing enterprise, composed of City College of San Francisco and Adult/Occupational schools. Last year the enrollment increased over ten per cent. This year it will exceed the equivalent of 24,000 full-time students and
will serve 80,000 individuals at the junior college and adult education levels with a budget of some $25 million.

If both students and taxpayers are to get maximum returns on their investment of time and money, it is imperative that the Community College District be under the surveillance of its own Governing Board elected by the people as in all other community college districts in California.

The California State Legislature long ago expressed the intent that separate boards for community college districts be standard practice. The most recent action (1968) taken was the passage of a bill establishing the principle that no district except a community college district maintain a community college on or after July, 1970. It also provided that when there was a common governing board serving both unified and community college districts, that separate agenda, policies and fiscal procedures be developed. This is the existing situation in San Francisco: the same individuals serve as the Governing Board for the Unified and the Community College District. In addition, the State Legislature provided that a Board could, on its own initiative establish a separate community college board, leaving it up to the members to decide on which they preferred to serve. Unfortunately in San Francisco the Charter prevented the Board from making such a choice. Section 134 states that all public schools in the City and County of San Francisco be under the control and management of a Board of Education. This was interpreted by the City Attorney to mean that until a Charter amendment is passed there could be no separation of Governing Boards. This is why Proposition “L” is on the ballot for your approval this November.

A Yes vote on Proposition “L” will officially establish the difference between San Francisco’s two major educational activities. It will allow members of a new and distinct governing board to give their undivided attention to the increasingly difficult and important problems facing the Community College District.

Among the many supporters recognizing the practical need for a separate Governing Board for the San Francisco Community College District, urging a Yes vote on Proposition “L” are the endorsers listed below.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Oscar E. Anderson
Reynold H. Colvin
Louis G. Conlan
Sal Cordova
Adolfo de Urioste
Lee Dolson
John F. Duffy, Jr.
Alex A. Esclamado
Edwin Frediani
Abel Gonzalez
George A, Harter
Frieda Klussmann
Bert W. Levit
Lloyd D. Luckmann
Leon Markel
Milton Marks
Jack B. McKay
Julita T. McLeod
Leo A. Musso
Olive M. Neick
Bev Pasqualetti
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Paul Scholten, M.D.
John M. Selig
Douglas L. Siden
John E. Sullivan
Melvin M. Swig
Otto F. Weber
James E. Ballard
Rudy Tham
Gerald Comoroto
Joseph E. Tinney
Alvin F. Derre
Albert R. Jonsen, S.J.
John Francis Foran, Assemblyman
George Moscone
Richard L. Swig, President, Fairmont Hotel Company
Tremain P. Loud, Lessee, Hotel Californian
Simon Toulouse
Eugene I. Harrington, Chairman of the Board, Honig, Cooper & Harrington
Robert M. Cawson, President, A and A/O Faculty Senate
Orville Luster
Frances M. McAteer
Judge Leland J. Lazarus
Walter Carpeneti
Harry W. Low
Louis M. Heilbrun
Stephen L. Mana
S. I. Hayakawa
Dean Goodman
Joseph Belardi
Mary Foehr
Jane Morrison
Leon Markel
Mrs. Burt Toler
Joseph G. Kennedy
Mrs. Elgin Heintz
Armand DeMartini
T. J. Mellon

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER: SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "L"

Adds Section 136.1: Establishes a separate governing board for San
Francisco Community College District and provides for election
of members thereof.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my
opinion, the increase cost of compensation for members of the San
Francisco Community College District governing board would be
$8,400 annually. Based on the 1971-1972 assessment roll, this annual
increase is equivalent to thirty-six thousandths (.036) of one cent
in the tax rate.

Other provisions of the amendment in themselves do not create
any additional cost, but as product of their application, additional
costs may be incurred which are not determinable at this time.
NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION M

Repeals Section 117.1 and adds Section 117.1: Prescribes procedure for amendments to zoning ordi-
nances, reclassifications of property or establish-
ment, abolition or modification of setback lines.

CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION M

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors
of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of
said City and County by deleting Section 117.1 thereof and adding
Section 117.1 thereto relating to zoning reclassification.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county
at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to
amend the charter of said city and county by deleting Section 117.1
thereof and adding Section 117.1 thereto, to read as follows:

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

((New Provisions for Zone Changes))

((Section 117.1. The city planning commission shall consider
and hold hearings on proposed changes in the zoning ordinance
which classifies the uses to which property in the city and county
may be put, and on the establishment or changing of building set-
back lines, either on its own motion, or on the application of inter-
ested property owners or their authorized agents. The board of
supervisors, by ordinance, shall establish procedure for action on
such matters. The city planning commission shall give notice of
time and place of such hearings and shall act upon such applica-
tions for change within ninety days from the date of conclusion of
the hearing. Failure to act within said time shall constitute dis-
approval. If approved, such applications, together with the approval of the commission, shall be presented to the board of supervisors, which may adopt such changes by a majority vote. If disapproved, the action of the city planning commission shall be final, except that appeal may be taken from the ruling of the commission by filing written protest with the board of supervisors within a period of thirty days after the action of the city planning commission, and if such protest is subscribed by the owners of twenty per cent of the property affected. The board of supervisors or the clerk thereof shall set a time and place for hearing such appeal, which shall be not less than ten nor more than thirty days after such filing. The board must decide such appeal within ten days of the time so set for such hearing, provided that, if the full membership of the board is not present on the last day on which said objections are set or continued for hearing within said period, the board may postpone said hearing and decision thereon until, but not later than, the full membership of the board is present, or the action of the commission shall be deemed to be approved by the board, provided, further, that the latest date to which said hearing and decision may be postponed on such account shall not be more than ninety (90) days from the date of filing of such protest. The supervisors may disapprove the action of the commission on such appeal by a vote of not less than two-thirds of all members of the board and adopt such change in said ordinance. Any action of the commission so appealed shall not become effective unless and until approved by the board within the time aforesaid. In case of disapproval by the commission or by the supervisors on appeal of a proposed change, such proposed change may not be resubmitted to or reconsidered by the commission for at least one year.)

Zoning Provisions

Section 117.1. The city planning commission shall consider and hold hearings on proposed ordinances and amendments thereto regulating or controlling the height, area, bulk, setbacks, location, use or related aspects of any building or structure or land, including but not limited to the zoning ordinance and other portions of the city planning code. Such proposals may be initiated by the board of supervisors and referred to the commission, or they may be initiated by the commission itself. In the case of a reclassification of property (change in district boundaries) or establishment, abolition or modification of a setback line, such proposals may be initiated by the application of interested property owners or their authorized agents.

Procedures for action on such matters shall be as prescribed by the board of supervisors by ordinance. The commission shall approve any such proposal in whole or in part, or shall disapprove it.

If the commission approves the proposal in whole or in part, it shall be presented to the board of supervisors together with the written approval of the commission, and the board may adopt such proposal, as approved, by ordinance by a majority vote.

If the commission disapproves the proposal in whole or in part, such action shall be final; except that in the case of a proposal initiated by the board, notice of the commission action shall be sent to the board without the necessity for an appeal; and except further that, in the case of a reclassification of property or estab-
lishment, abolition or modification of a setback line initiated by application, appeal may be taken to the board of supervisors by filing written notice of appeal with the said board within thirty days after such action. Such notice of appeal shall be subscribed by the owners of at least twenty per cent of the property affected by such change, excluding any property that is owned by the City and County of San Francisco, the United States Government or the State of California, or any department or agency thereof, or by any special district, unless the owner of such property shall itself be a subscriber of the notice of appeal. An action of the city planning commission so appealed shall not become effective unless and until approved by the board of supervisors in accordance with this section.

Upon receiving such written notice of appeal, the board of supervisors or the clerk thereof shall set a time and place for hearing such appeal, which shall be not less than ten (10) nor more than thirty (30) days after the filing of such notice of appeal. The board of supervisors must decide such appeal within thirty (30) days of the time set forth for the hearing thereon, provided that, if the full membership of the board is not present on the last day on which said appeal is set or continued for hearing within said period, the board may postpone said hearing and decision thereon until, but not later than, the full membership of the board is present; provided, further, that the latest date to which said hearing and decision may be so postponed shall be not more than ninety (90) days from the date of filing of the appeal. Failure of the board of supervisors to act within such time limit shall be deemed to constitute approval by the board of the action of the city planning commission.

In acting upon any such appeal, or in acting upon any proposal initiated by the board of supervisors and disapproved by the commission, said board of supervisors may disapprove the action of the commission, and in the event of any such disapproval, the board shall adopt the proposed ordinance or amendment thereto at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the board; provided, however, that in the case of any reclassification of property or establishment, abolition or modification of a setback line, any such disapproval and adoption shall be by a vote of not less than two-thirds of all members of the board.

Whenever any such proposed ordinance or amendment thereto, or any part thereof, initiated by application, has been disapproved by the city planning commission or by the board of supervisors on appeal, no application proposing the same or substantially the same ordinance or amendment shall be resubmitted to or reconsidered by the commission within a period of one year from the effective date of final action upon the earlier application.


Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "M"

This amendment relates to the hearing procedure on appeals to the Board of Supervisors from City Planning Commission disapprovals in zoning cases. Section 117.1 now provides that the Board of Supervisors must decide such appeals within 10 days of the time set for hearing thereon, except that if the full membership of the Board is not in attendance, the hearing and decision may be postponed each week, for up to a total of 90 days from the date the appeal was filed. The amendment would allow initial postponement of up to 30 days instead of the present 10, while retaining the possibility of weekly postponement beyond that 30 days if a full Board is not present, within the overall 90-day limit.

The advantage of this amendment is that it would focus the Board’s attention on setting a specific hearing date within the 30-day period and would thus tend to reduce the likelihood of further delays. Repeated delays in public hearings will inevitably result in great inconvenience to the general public. This amendment would help avoid such situations.

The amendment also incorporates a number of minor changes in wording to clarify the meaning and application of Section 117.1.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

PROPOSITION N

Amends Section 165.2 and adds Sections 161.4 and 165.2.2, relating to retirement benefits of miscellaneous employees; provides for military service credit and recalculation of certain retirement allowances.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION N

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 165.2 thereof and adding Sections 161.4 and 165.2.2 thereto, relating to the Retirement System.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to
amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 165.2 thereof and adding Sections 161.4 and 165.2.2 thereto, to read as follows:

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

Section 165.2. Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the charter on the effective date of this amendment, hereby designated as the first day of the month next following its ratification by the State Legislature, and persons who become miscellaneous officers and employees after said effective date, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in sections 158 to 161, both inclusive, of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 165 of the charter on said effective date shall continue to be members of the system under section 165 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) The following words and phrases as used in this section, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meaning:

"Retirement allowance," or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation," as distinguished from benefits under the workmen's compensation laws of the State of California shall mean all remuneration whether in cash or by other allowances made by the city and county, for service qualifying for credit under this section.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation as determined by the retirement board, which would have been earned by the member had the worker, throughout the period under consideration, the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city service he was in the position first held by him in city service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive
years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 165 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 158 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 159 of the charter.

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

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of ((fifty-five)) fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a retirement allowance, at the rate of ((1%/)) 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) of this section shall be greater in amount than the service retirement allowance otherwise payable to such member under this subsection (B), then such member shall receive as his service retirement allowance, in lieu of the allowance otherwise payable under this subsection (B), an allowance computed in accordance with the formula provided in subsection (F). The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of sixty years, after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty-five years, computed under subsection (G), shall be ((such as can be provided at the age of retirement by the actuarial value, at the age of retirement, of the allowance to which he would be entitled upon retirement at age sixty and with the service credited at the date of actual retirement)) an allowance equal to the percentage of said final average compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Per cent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¼</td>
<td>1.9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59½</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¾</td>
<td>1.9750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member’s retirement allowance exceed seventy-five per cent of his average final compensation.

The service retirement allowance of any member retiring prior to attaining the age of fifty-five years after rendering twenty years or more of such service and having attained the age of fifty years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said final average compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Per cent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) of this section, may elect to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance, partly in an allowance to be received by him throughout his life, and partly in other benefits payable after his death to another person or persons, provided that such election shall be subject to all the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar elections by other members of the retirement system, including the character and amount of such other benefits; provided, however, that at any time within 30 days after the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective, a member who has attained the age of 65 years may elect, without right of revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 165.6 of this charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall not be less than $100 per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that as to any member with fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. In the calculations under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the aggregate retirement allowance shall be taken into account in applying the provisions of this subsection providing for a minimum retirement allowance. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied on full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

(C) Any member who becomes incapacitated for performance of duty because of disability determined by the retirement board to be of extended and uncertain duration, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service credited in the retirement system in the aggregate, computed as provided in subsection (G) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and ((one-half)) eight-tenths per cent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection (A) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds ((one-third (⅓))) forty per cent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and ((one-half (1½))) eight-tenths per cent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment
by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed ((one-third (1/3))) forty per cent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement allowances shall be calculated, in the manner prescribed, for each class of service, the average final compensation in each case being that for the respective class of service; provided that the average final compensation upon which the minimum total retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the ((five (5))) three years immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board’s own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(D) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under workmen’s compensation laws of the State of California.

(E) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause:

(1) If no benefits is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (E), a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary consisting of the compensation earnable by him during the six months immediately preceding death, plus his contributions and interest credited thereon.

(2) If, at the date of his death, he was qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subdivision (B) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse’s death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pur-
suant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(b) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein provided, shall die before or after making such election but before receiving any payment pursuant to such election, then the legally appointed guardian of the unmarried children of the member under the age of eighteen years may make the election herein provided before any benefit has been paid under this subsection (E), for and on behalf of such children if in his judgment it appears to be in their interest and advantage, and the election so made shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties in interest.

If any person other than such surviving spouse shall have and be paid a community property interest in any portion of any benefit provided under this subsection (E), any allowance payable under this subdivision (2) shall be reduced by the actuarial equivalent, at the date of the member’s death, of the amount of benefits paid to such other person.

Upon the death of a member after retirement and regardless of the cause of death, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary in the manner and subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors for the payment of a similar death benefit upon the death of other retired members.

(F) Should any miscellaneous member cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to cover similar terminations of employment and reemployment with and without redeposit of withdrawn accumulated contributions of other members of the retirement system, provided that if such member is entitled to be credited with at least ten years of service or if his accumulated contributions exceed one thousand dollars ($1,000), he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after said termination of service, or if the termination was by lay-off, 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the ret-
tirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ per cent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 161 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 165.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and service rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefor shall be required of the city and county.

(6) Time during which a member is absent from city service by reason of injury or illness determined within one year after the end of such absence to have arisen out of and occurred in the course of his employment in city service, provided that such mem-
ber elects to make contributions and does make contributions in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision (6).

Any member who elects pursuant to this subdivision (6) to make contributions and receive credit for time during which he was absent from city service by reason of injury or illness determined to have arisen out of and occurred in the course of his employment in city service shall contribute to the retirement fund the amount necessary to make the accumulated contributions standing to his credit in his individual account equal to the amount such accumulated contributions would have been had he not been so absent.

Payment of the contributions required by this subdivision (6) shall be made in a lump-sum at the time of election or by installment payments beginning immediately upon the making of such election and extending over a period not in excess of the period the member was so absent. Installment payments shall be made at times and in a manner fixed by the retirement board. The retirement board shall adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this subdivision (6).

(H) All payments provided under this section shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) The rate of contribution of each member under this section shall be based on his nearest age at the effective date of his membership in the retirement system. The normal rate of contribution of each such member, to be effective from the effective date of membership under this section, shall be such as, on the average for such member, will provide, assuming service without interruption, under subsection (B) of this section, one-half of that portion of the service retirement allowance to which he would be entitled if retired at age sixty or higher age after rendering ten years of service for retirement under that subsection. No adjustment shall be included in said rates because of time during which members have contributed at different rates. Members' rates of contributions shall be changed only in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for changing contribution rates of other members.

(2) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under this section, a sum determined by applying the member's rate of contribution to such compensation. Amounts which would have been deducted in the absence of the limit on such deductions according to service credited, shall be paid to the retirement system following the removal of such limit, in manner and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contributions shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, under this section or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in subsections (E) and (F) of this section, provided that the
portion of the salaries of the teachers as provided in section 165, paragraph (a), as a basis for fixing the contributions to be made, and the benefits to be received, by the teachers under the retirement system shall be determined by the method provided in section 165, paragraph (a) and shall not be less than eighty per cent of the total salary received by the teachers, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

(3) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to the effective date hereof, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(4) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county and standing to its credit, on the effective date hereof, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(5) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), to provide the benefits payable under this section. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by each member prior to the date upon which his rate of contribution is determined in paragraph (1), subsection (H), shall not be less during any fiscal year than the amount of such benefits paid during said year. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder which shall be based on service rendered by respective members on and after the date stated in the next preceding sentence, shall be made in annual installments, and the installment to be paid in any year shall be determined by the application of a percentage to the total salaries paid during said year, to persons who are members under this section, said percentage to be the ratio of the value of the effective date hereof, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said systems to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said in-
vestigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 165.2 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1971, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(6) To promote the stability of the retirement system through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on said effective date, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(I) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in subsection (B) of this section as requisite to retirement, a member shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said subsection (B), and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

(J) No person retired under this section, for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall serve in any elective or appointive position in the city and county service, including membership on boards and commissions, nor shall such persons receive any payment for service rendered to the city and county after retirement, provided that service as an election officer or juror shall not be affected by this section.

(K) Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with this section, or with any part thereof, shall be superseded by the contents of this section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or subsection of this section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect.

(L) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (B), (C), (F) or (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated contributions; provided, however, that, if such member is qualified for service retirement by reason of service and age under the provisions of subsection (B) of this section, he shall have the right to elect, without right of revocation and within 90 days after his removal from office or employment, whether to withdraw all of his accumulated contributions or to receive as his sole benefit under the retirement system an annuity which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions at the time of such removal from office or employment.
(M) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 5, 1968, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

(N) The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1971, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

Section 161.4. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this charter, any member who was serving in the armed forces of the United States or the State of California during time of war or any emergency lawfully declared by the President of the United States, who had standing on an eligible list for appointment to a permanent position and was reached for certification to a permanent position while so serving shall have the right to elect to make contributions as provided in this section and to receive credit in this system as city service for all or any part of the time after he was so reached during which he was so serving; provided, however, that no member shall have such right unless he entered into employment with the city and county as a result of such certification made in accordance with the provisions of section 153 of the charter within one year after his discharge from such armed forces.

Any member who elects pursuant to this section to make contributions and receive credit for such time shall contribute to the retirement system an amount determined by applying the rate of contribution first applicable to him on the effective date of his membership in the retirement system to the monthly compensation earnable by him on said date, together with interest on said amount at the rates of interest being used from time to time under the retirement system.

The board of supervisors shall provide by ordinance the time and manner for making said contributions and for the crediting of such service as service credit.

Section 165.2.2. Every retirement allowance payable to or on account of a member who retired under the provisions of section 165.2 of this charter on or after July 1, 1947, and prior to April 1, 1968, is hereby increased for time commencing on the effective date of this section, hereby designated as the first day of the month next following ratification by the State Legislature, to the amount it would have been if such allowance had been computed, on the date such member's retirement allowance was first effective, as if "average final compensation" were defined as the average monthly
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compensation earned by a member during any three consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average compensation is the highest.

This section does not give any person retired under the provisions of section 165.2, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

Any increase in any retirement allowance resulting from the recalculation provided for in this section shall be disregarded in connection with any adjustment of retirement allowances pursuant to the provisions of section 164.1 of this charter.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "N"

Vote Yes on Proposition "N"

Proposition "N" is a Charter amendment designed to improve retirement and pension benefits for San Francisco's School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees. It is the first amendment to appear on the ballot since 1947 and represents the first change in retirement benefits for School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees since that date.

1947 to 1971—a period of 24 years, in which School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees have enjoyed no improvements in retirement and pension benefits. On the other hand, thousands upon thousands of employees in both private industry and public service have enjoyed substantial retirement and pension benefit improvements.

In private industry, as reported by the California Department of Industrial Relations—July 1970, 1,400,000 workers in the State of California are covered by pension plans in which employers pay the full cost of pension benefits. Compare this with San Francisco, where School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees pay a substantial share of the cost of retirement benefits. Whereas, since 1947 employees in private industry have achieved full employer-paid pension plans, School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees have experienced increased retirement costs, and with no improvements in basic benefits.

Consider also that Governor Reagan, on June 21, 1971, signed law legislation granting substantial improvements in retirement benefits for over 400,000 public employees in State service and in other counties, cities and school districts in California. Prior to June 21, 1971, State and other public employees enjoyed retirement benefits not available to San Francisco's School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees. And now, with the Governor's approval, these same employees will enjoy even greater benefits.

Proposition "N" will correct this inequity by granting School Teachers and Miscellaneous Employees a modest, but well-deserved increase in retirement benefits.

At the same time, Proposition "N" will afford a small, but essential, increase in retirement allowances to some 2,900 employees who retired prior to April 1966. These retired employees have borne the brunt of severe inflation, increased taxes, and the steadily rising cost of living. These retired employees deserve immediate relief of a serious financial plight.
Finally, Proposition “N” will grant service credit in the Retirement System to a handful of employees who were serving their country in time of war and who were reached for appointment to a Civil Service position while serving in the Armed Forces, but who could not accept an appointment because of wartime service. These employees, some 64 in number, including Police Officers and Fire Fighters, are being deprived of credit in the Retirement System for the simple reason that they answered their country’s call to service during wartime. This inequity should be erased.

Vote Yes on Proposition “N”. It is a fair, reasonable and deserving proposition. School Teachers, Police Officers, Fire Fighters, and Miscellaneous Employees urge you to vote Yes on Proposition “N.”

Vote Yes on Proposition “N”

Sponsored by the Municipal Improvement League, consisting of:
American Federation of Technical Engineers Local 17
Automotive Machinists Lodge No. 1305
Civil Service Association
Civil Service Building Maintenance Union Local 66A
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Association of San Francisco
Cooks, Pastry Cooks & Assistants Local 44
Deputy Sheriffs’ Association Inc. of San Francisco
Hospital and Institutional Workers’ Union Local 250
International Union of Operating Engineers Stationary Local 39
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco City and County Employees Union Local 400
San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
San Francisco Federation of Teachers Local 61
San Francisco City and County Employees Local 747
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
San Francisco Police Officers’ Association
San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association Inc.
Staff Council Bureau of Public Health Nursing
Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Federation of Public Employees, Local 292, Transport Workers Union
Professional and Technical Engineers Association
San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Police Officers Association

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “N”

Vote No on “N” Another Costly Pension Scheme!

“N” must be defeated because it would add over $5,000,000 a year to your taxes, equal to 22 cents in the tax rate, as reported by the Controller.

Don’t be misled. City employees have an expensive pension plan plus Social Security, too.
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Vote No on "N".
An unnecessary and extravagant proposal.
This argument sponsored by the following members of The San Francisco Municipal Conference:
Building Owners & Managers Assn. S.F. Real Estate Board
Down Town Association, S.F.

Lloyd E. Graybiel, Chairman

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 193
PROPOSITION "N"
Amends Section 165.2 and adds Section 161.4 and 165.2.2, relating to retirement benefits of miscellaneous employees; provides for military service credit and recalculation of certain retirement allowances.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on a report by the Employees’ Retirement System, in my opinion, it is estimated that the annual increase in the cost of government of the City and County of San Francisco and San Francisco School Districts would be approximately $5,636,129 and of this amount, $5,320,506 would be required from property taxes. Based on the 1971-1972 assessment roll, this estimated annual increase of $5,320,506 is equivalent to twenty-two and eighty hundredths (22.80) cents in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION O

Amends Sections 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23, 72, 141, 147.1, 151 and 224, and adds Section 10.1, relating to publication, printing and notices relating to legislation and legislative meetings.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION O

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Sections 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23, 72, 141, 147.1, 151 and 224, and adding Section 10.1 thereto, relating to publications, printing and notices relative to legislation and legislative meetings.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Sections 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23, 72, 141, 147.1, 151 and 224, and adding Section 10.1 thereto, so that the same shall read as follows: 123
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Section 10. The board of supervisors shall consist of eleven members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ninety-six hundred dollars ($9,600) per year, and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of five thousand dollars ($5,000).

At twelve o’clock noon on the 8th day of January next following their election, the newly elected and continuing members of the board of supervisors shall meet at the legislative chamber in the City Hall, and thereafter regular meetings shall be held as fixed by resolution. 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. 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.

The meetings of the board shall be held in the City Hall, provided that, in case of emergency, the board, by resolution, may designate some other appropriate place as its temporary meeting place. ((The board shall cause a calendar of the business scheduled for each meeting to be published and shall keep and publish a journal of its proceedings.)) Notice of any special meeting shall be published at least twenty-four hours in advance of such special meeting.

Calendars

Section 10.1. A written calendar of the business scheduled for each meeting of the board of supervisors or any standing or special committee comprised of board members and established by the board shall be prepared and available to the public before each meeting.

Summaries of board and committee calendar items of general public interest, as determined by the clerk of the board, and a statement of where and when copies of proposed ordinances and resolutions may be obtained, shall be published commencing at least thirty-six hours before the commencement time of each regular meeting and at least eighteen hours before the commencement time of each special meeting. The board may also provide for additional publicity whenever it determines the public interest would be served.

Action by Resolution or Ordinance

Section 13. Action by the board of supervisors shall be by ordinance or resolution in writing introduced by a member or by a committee of said board and passed or adopted by a majority of all the members of the board at each reading. Every legislative act shall be by ordinance. The enacting clause of all ordinances shall be, “Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco.” Every ordinance and resolution, except ordinances making appropriations, shall be confined to one subject which shall be clearly expressed in the title, and ordinances making annual or supplemental appropriations shall be confined to the subject of appropriations.

If any subject is embraced in an ordinance and is not expressed
in the title thereof, the ordinance shall be void only as to so much thereof as is not expressed in the title. Any ordinance may be amended by an ordinance amending or repealing the particular sections thereof or adding sections thereto.

An ordinance shall be passed by the board of supervisors only after reference to and report thereon from committee, unless it be an ordinance prepared and reported out by committee, and after two readings and votes at separate meetings of the board, which meetings shall be at least five days apart; provided, however, that as to an emergency measure as defined in section 16, reference to committee or the readings and votes at separate meetings may be waived by a three-fourths vote of all members of the board. The existing or impending emergency as defined in such ordinance shall be declared by specific section in such emergency ordinance. The annual appropriation ordinance shall be passed only after two readings, not less than five days apart, and the second or final passage shall be not less than fifteen days after the introduction of each ordinance.

No ordinance granting a franchise shall be finally passed within ninety days of its introduction.

No resolution shall be adopted by the board of supervisors on the date of its introduction and without reference to committee, except by the unanimous consent of the supervisors present.

Except as otherwise provided in this charter, or by ordinance, notice of the title or the purport and subject matter of each proposed ordinance which is introduced and referred to committee shall be published within three days after its presentation to the board and a copy of such proposed ordinance shall be kept available for inspection in the office of the clerk of the board. (All ordinances shall be published upon passage for second reading. Emergency ordinances shall be published immediately on passage. The term “published” as used in this charter shall mean publication in the official newspaper as required by charter. The official newspaper is hereby defined to be a daily newspaper of general circulation, published in the city and county and which has a bona fide daily circulation of at least 8,000 copies. Whenever the official newspaper is not able to publish or circulate for any reason, the board of supervisors shall designate by resolution a substitute newspaper or newspapers, until such time as the official newspaper resumes publication or circulation.))

Each ordinance required to be included in the municipal code shall be printed promptly after final passage, and copies shall be made available to the public.

The vote on all ordinances and resolutions upon each reading shall be by ayes and noes. The vote by ayes and noes on all measures shall be recorded in the journal of the proceedings of the board.

Record (Publication and Effect) and Published

Notices of Ordinances and Resolutions

Section 15. All ordinances, after final passage or upon their becoming effective shall be certified by the clerk of the board and recorded in a book kept for that purpose, and resolutions adopted shall be certified and recorded in like manner. (Except in case of an emergency measure passed and not previously published, and except as otherwise specified in this charter, publication of ordi-
nances and resolutions in full shall not be required after final pass-
age.) Notice that an ordinance ((or resolution has passed or be-
come final)) has been passed for second reading, that an ordinance
has been finally passed, and that a resolution has been adopted, to-
gether with a statement of where copies may be obtained, shall be
published once within five days of such ((final passage)) passage
for second reading, final passage or adoption. To amend an ordi-
nance which has proceeded to second reading shall require ((publi-
cation of the ordinance as amended and)) proceeding de novo.

Codification of Ordinances; Printing of Charter

Section 17. Ordinances previously adopted and continuing in
force may be codified or recodified or rearranged by ordinance. Any
such ordinance shall supersede and repeal all general ordinances in
effect prior thereto and shall be construed to be confined to a single
subject.

Any such ordinance shall require ((publication)) printing only
in bound or loose leaf book form, which shall constitute publication
for all purposes. Any such ((publication)) printing shall contain
certificates of the mayor, the clerk of the board of supervisors and
the city attorney of the correctness of such codification and ((publi-
cation)) printing.

Any such ordinance shall be amended by an ordinance amending
or repealing the particular sections thereof or adding sections there-
to. For the purposes of any codification or recodification and the
validity thereof, the procedure, effect, adoption or enactment and
publication of any prior codification, including the enacting ordi-
nance, amendments thereto, the contents of any such code, the cer-
tification and publication thereof and all other proceedings and
matters in respect thereto, shall be deemed to be valid.

With any ((publication)) printing of the charter, there shall be
included initiative ordinances and digests of reported court de-
cisions relating to said charter and ordinances.

The board of supervisors shall have power to enforce by appro-
priate legislation the provisions of this section.

Powers and Duties of Boards and Commissions

Section 19. The board of supervisors and each board and com-
mission appointed by the mayor, or otherwise provided by this
charter, shall have powers and duties as follows:

(a) To prescribe reasonable rules and regulations not incon-
sistent with this charter for the conduct of its affairs, for the dis-
tribution and performance of its business, for the conduct and gov-
ernment of its officers and employees, and for the administration,
custody and protection of property under its control and books,
records and papers appertaining to its affairs. The board of super-
visors, by ordinance, may provide that rules and regulations of any
board or commission, or general orders of any department head
issued by authority of any board or commission that are of general
public concern shall be ((published or)) posted or otherwise ade-
quately publicized.

(b) To appoint one of its members as president to hold office for
such term as each such board or commission by its rules or regula-
tions, not inconsistent with this charter, may prescribe.

(c) To establish such standing or special committees as it shall
deem necessary.
(d) To receive, on behalf of the city and county, gifts, devises and bequests for any purpose connected with or incidental to the department or affairs placed in its charge, and to administer, execute and perform the terms and conditions of trusts or any gift, devise or bequest which may be accepted by vote of the people or that nothing herein contained shall restrict the power of hearing and inquiry as provided in this charter.

**Administrative Code**

Section 23. The powers and duties of the departments and offices which by this charter are established or continued as departments or offices under elective officers, boards or commissions or the chief administrative officer, as such powers and duties exist at the time this charter shall go into effect, shall be continued as powers and duties of each such department or office, except as otherwise provided in this charter.

The board of supervisors may enact and provide for ((the publication in printed form)) **printing** of an administrative code, which shall specify or detail the powers, duties, methods and procedure in the several departments and offices.

**Adoption of the Budget and the Appropriation Ordinance**

Section 72. Not later than the 15th day of April in each year, the mayor shall transmit to the board of supervisors the consolidated budget estimates for all departments and offices of, and the proposed budget for, the city and county for the ensuing fiscal year, including a detailed estimate of all revenues of each department and an estimate of the amount required to meet bond interest, redemption and other fixed charges of the city and county, and the revenues applicable thereto. He shall, by message accompanying such proposed budget, comment upon the financial program incorporated therein, the important changes as compared with the previous budget, and bond issues, if any, as recommended by him.

The mayor shall submit to the board of supervisors, at the time that he submits said budget estimates and said proposed budget, a draft of the annual appropriation ordinance for the ensuing fiscal year, which shall be prepared by the controller. This shall be based on the proposed budget and shall be drafted to contain such provisions and detail as to furnish an adequate basis for fiscal and accounting control by the controller of each revenue and expenditure appropriation item for the ensuing fiscal year. Upon submission it shall be deemed to have been regularly introduced. ((, and together with the proposed budget, shall be published as required for ordinances.))

The detail of the proposed budget ((to be published)) shall be as follows:

1. Total cost for conducting each department, bureau, office, board or commission for the ensuing fiscal year, segregated according to basic objects of expenditure for each.
2. A detail schedule of positions and compensations, showing any increases or decreases in any department or office.
3. A detail schedule of items for capital outlay.
4. The aforementioned consolidated estimates and schedules shall also include by items contained therein the following information:
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(a) Expenditures for the last complete fiscal year.
(b) Estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year.
(c) Proposed increases or decreases as compared with the budget allowances for the current fiscal year.

The board of supervisors shall ((provide printed)) cause copies of the mayor's budget message and proposed budget thus prepared, including comparative expenditures and revenues for the current and preceding fiscal years and other information transmitted there- with, ((for official use and public demand as requested)) to be made available for official use and to be placed and maintained for public inspection in the respective offices of the clerk of the board of supervisors and the controller, the main, branch and law libraries, and such other public locations as the board in its discretion may designate.

Within five days following receipt of the proposed budget by the board of supervisors, the controller shall submit to the board a brief and simple summary of its contents in a form prescribed by the controller and designed to aid the residents of the city and county in understanding and evaluating the need for, purposes, unit costs, intended results and supportive revenue sources of each departmental program. Upon submittal of the summary, the board shall cause it to be published and shall cause copies to be made available to the public.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ((five)) ten days after ((publication as in this section provided)) receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, but shall not increase any amount or add any new item for personal services or materials, supplies, or contractual services, for any department, unless requested in writing so to do by the mayor, on the recommendation of the chief administrative officer, board, commission or elective officer, in charge of such department.

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

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

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of May, nor later than the 1st day of June, the board shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall pass the necessary appropriation ordinance. ((If the appropriation ordinance as submitted by the mayor is amended by the supervisors, the appropriation ordinance shall be rereadvertised prior to final reading or passage, in the manner required for ordinances.))
Any item in such appropriation ordinance except for bond interest, redemption or other fixed charges, may be vetoed in whole or in part by the mayor within ten days of receipt by him from the clerk of the board of supervisors of the ordinance as passed by the board, and the board of supervisors shall act on such veto not later than the 20th day of June.

The several items of expenditure appropriated in each annual appropriation ordinance, being based on estimated receipts, income or revenues which may not be fully realized, it shall be incumbent upon the controller to establish a schedule of allotments, monthly or quarterly as he may determine, under which the sums appropriated to the several departments shall be expended. The controller shall revise such revenue estimates monthly. If such revised estimates indicate a shortage the controller shall hold in reserve an equivalent amount of the corresponding expenditure appropriations set forth in any said annual appropriation ordinance until the collection of the amount as originally estimated is assured, and in all cases where it is provided by this charter that a specified or minimum tax shall be levied for any department the amount of the appropriation in any annual appropriation ordinance derived from taxes shall not exceed the amount actually produced by levy made for said department. The controller in issuing warrants or in certifying contracts or purchase orders or other encumbrances, pursuant to section 86 of this charter, shall consider only the allotted portions of appropriation items to be available for encumbrance or expenditure and shall not approve the incurring of liability under any allotment in excess of the amount of such allotment. In case of emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of apportionment, an additional allotment for a period may be made on the recommendation of the department head and that of the chief administrative officer, board or commission and the approval of the controller. After the allotment schedule has been established or fixed, as heretofore provided, it shall be unlawful for any department or officer to expend or cause to be expended a sum greater than the amount set forth for the particular activity in the said allotment schedule so established unless an additional allotment is made, as herein provided.

Subject to the restrictions hereinbefore in this section included, the several amounts of estimated revenue and proposed expenditures contained in the annual appropriation ordinance as adopted by the board of supervisors shall be and become appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year to and for the several departments, bureaus, offices, utilities, boards or commissions, and for the purposes specified, and each department for which an expenditure appropriation has been made shall be authorized to use the money so appropriated for the purposes specified in the appropriations ordinance, and within the limits of the appropriation. The appropriation ordinance shall constitute the authority for the controller to set up the required revenue and expenditure accounts. Appropriation items for bond interest, bond redemption, fixed charges and other purposes not appropriated to a specific department shall be subject to the administration of and expenditure by the chief administrative officer for the respective purposes for which such appropriations are made.
Powers and Duties

Section 141. The civil service commission shall be the employment and personnel department of the city and county and shall determine appointments on the basis of merit and fitness, as shown by appropriate tests. The commission shall classify, and from time to time may reclassify, in accordance with duties and responsibilities of the employment, and training and experience required, all places of employment in the departments and offices of the city and county not specifically exempted by this charter from the civil service provisions thereof, or which may be created hereafter by general law and not specifically exempted from said civil service provisions. The commission shall likewise classify all other positions or other places of employment in the city and county service specifically exempted from the civil service provisions of this charter, but which, by the provisions of section 151, thereof, are made subject to classification for salary standardization purposes on the basis of duties and responsibilities of the employment and training and experience required. The civil service commission shall be the judge of such classification.

The commission shall also, in accordance with duties and responsibilities, allocate, and from time to time may re-allocate, the positions to the various classes of the classification. The allocation or re-allocation of a position shall not adversely affect the civil service rights of an occupant regularly holding such position. No person shall hold a position outside of the classification to which he has been appointed, provided that every employee of any department or office shall discharge any of the duties pertaining to such department or office to which his chief may temporarily assign him.

The class titles and class numbers assigned to positions by the commission shall be used in all records, reports, statements and communications, including the compensation schedule, annual budget and salary ordinance, payrolls, and appropriation ordinances.

The commission shall adopt rules to carry out the civil service provisions of this charter and, except as otherwise provided in this charter, such rules shall govern applications; examinations; eligibility; duration of eligible lists; certification of eligibles; appointments; promotions; transfers; resignations; lay-offs or reduction in force, both permanent and temporary, due to lack of work or funds, retrenchment, or completion of work; the filling of positions, temporary, seasonal and permanent; classification; approval of payrolls; and such other matters as are not in conflict with this charter. The commission may, upon one week's notice, make changes in the rules, which changes shall thereupon be (published) printed, and be in force; provided that no such change in rules shall affect a case pending before the commission. The secretary may certify eligibles and payrolls and conduct examinations under the rules of the commission.

The commissioners shall have power to institute and prosecute legal proceedings for violations of any of the civil service provisions of this charter.

Inspection of Civil Service Examination Papers

Section 147.1. After the written portion of a civil service examination has been held, and prior to the scoring thereof, the questions used and the answers thereto shall be made available for review by
the participants. During the review period, participants shall have an opportunity to protest questions or answers they believe to be incorrect or improper, and for this purpose shall be permitted to bring to the place of review such written authorities as they may desire to assist them in the preparation of their protests. The written portion of the examination shall not be scored until all protested items have been acted on by the civil service commission and an official rating key has been adopted. After the official rating key has been adopted, the examination papers have been scored and the identification sheets of the participants have been opened so that the identity of the participant is known, the civil service commission shall not make any changes in the examination questions or answers.

After the civil service commission has prepared and ((published or)) posted a tentative list of eligibles, arranged in order of relative excellence, as the result of any examination held by said commission, all examination papers, questions and answers, and all marks and grades given on any test given in said examination shall be open to public inspection, provided that the identity of the examiner giving any mark or grade in an oral test shall not be disclosed; and provided further that the commission may require the payment of a fee of not more than one dollar ($1.) for the inspection of all of the papers relating to the examination of any one person participating in said examination; and provided further that a participant may examine his own examination papers without charge. The civil service commission shall have power to correct any error which in its judgment may have occurred in the rating of any participant in said examination, and to alter said ((published or)) posted tentative list of eligibles and to make changes accordingly therein. The civil service commission shall provide for a reasonable period of time for such inspection, but not less than three (3) working days for entrance examinations nor less than five (5) working days for promotive examinations nor more than two (2) calendar weeks for either entrance or promotive examinations. If no protests are received during the time limits provided by the civil service commission for such inspection, the tentative list of eligibles shall be given immediate final approval and adoption. If any protests are filed within the inspection period provided by the civil service commission, the investigation and action on such protests shall be expedited to the end that final approval and adoption of the eligible list may be made at the earliest possible time, provided that in no event shall such final approval and adoption be delayed beyond sixty (60) days after the date of ((publication or)) posting of the tentative list of eligibles.

The civil service commission by rules shall establish procedures for the review of written tests and the inspection of examination papers, as herein provided, for the maintenance of the security of examination material and for the protection of the public interest.

Standardization of Compensation

Section 151. The board of supervisors shall have power and it shall be its duty to fix by ordinance from time to time, as in this section provided, all salaries, wages and compensations of every kind and nature, except pension or retirement allowances, for the positions, or places of employment, of all officers and employees of
all departments, offices, boards and commissions of the city and county in all cases where such compensations are paid by the city and county.

Compensations specified in this charter shall not be subject to the provisions of this section. Compensations of the teaching and other technical forces of the school department and employees of the Steinhart Aquarium and law library departments, construction employees engaged outside of the city and county, part-time employees, and inmate and institutional help receiving less than fifty dollars ($50) per month, shall be fixed by the department head in charge thereof, with the approval of the board or commission, if any, in charge of the department concerned and subject to the budget and appropriation provisions of this charter; provided that part-time employees shall be recorded as such by a department head, only with the approval of the civil service commission and, when so recorded, shall be noted as part-time on payrolls, budget estimates, salary ordinance and similar documents.

In fixing schedules of compensation as in this section—provided, the civil service commission shall prepare and submit to the board of supervisors and the board shall adopt a schedule of compensations which shall include all classifications, positions and places of employment the wages or salaries for which are subject to the provisions of this section; provided, that the civil service commission shall from time to time prepare and submit to the board of supervisors and the board shall adopt amendments to the schedule of compensations which are necessary to cover any new classifications added by the civil service commission. Under the schedules of compensation recommended by the civil service commission and adopted by the board of supervisors as herein provided, like compensation shall be paid for like service, based upon the classification as provided in section 141 of the charter, and for those classifications of employment in which the practice is customary, the proposed schedules of compensation shall provide for minima, intermediate, and maxima salaries and for a method of advancing the salaries of employees from the minimum to the intermediate and to the maximum with due regard to seniority of service. The compensations fixed as herein provided shall be in accord with the generally prevailing rates of wages for like service and working conditions in private employment or in other comparable governmental organizations in this state; provided, that for specialized services which are peculiar to the municipal service and not duplicated elsewhere in private or other governmental organizations in this state, the commission shall recommend and the board of supervisors shall fix a compensation which shall be in accord with the wages paid in private employment or other governmental organizations in the state for the nearest comparable service and working conditions; and provided further that if the civil service commission determines on the basis of facts and data collected as hereinafter provided that the rates generally prevailing for a particular service in private employment or in other governmental organizations are inconsistent with the rates generally prevailing in private employment or other governmental organizations for services requiring generally comparable training and experience, the commission shall set forth these data in its official records and shall recommend and
the board of supervisors shall fix a compensatoin for such service that shall be consistent with the compensations fixed by the board of supervisors for other services requiring generally comparable training and experience; and provided further that the minimum compensation fixed for full time employments subject to the civil service provisions of this charter shall be not less than one hundred and six dollars ($106) per month.

The proposed schedules of compensation or any amendments thereto shall be recommended by the civil service commission solely on the basis of facts and data obtained in a comprehensive investigation and survey concerning wages paid in private employment for like service and working conditions or in other governmental organizations in this state. The commission shall set forth in the official records of its proceedings all of the data thus obtained and on the basis of such data the commission shall set forth in its official records an order making its findings as to what is the generally prevailing rate of pay for each class of employment in the municipal service as herein provided, and shall recommend a rate of pay for each such classification in accordance therewith. The proposed schedules of compensation recommended by the civil service commission shall be transmitted to the board of supervisors, together with a compilation of a summary of the data obtained and considered by the civil service commission and a comparison showing existing schedules. Before being presented to the board of supervisors for consideration, the proposed schedules and a comparison with existing schedules shall be ((published once a week for two weeks)) posted and otherwise publicized for a period of two weeks by the commission in a manner designed to give reasonable publicity thereof.

The board of supervisors may approve, amend or reject the schedule of compensations proposed by the civil service commission; provided, that before making any amendment thereto the data considered by the board of supervisors as warranting such amendment shall be transmitted to the civil service commission for review and analysis and the commission shall make a report thereon to the board of supervisors, together with a report as to what other changes, and the cost thereof such proposed amendment would require to maintain an equitable relationship with other rates in such schedule.

Where any compensation paid on January 1st, 1931, is higher than the standard compensation fixed as provided in this section for such position or employment, said compensation shall be continued to the incumbent of such position as long as he legally holds said position, and department heads, in cooperation with the civil service commission where said commission has jurisdiction, shall continuously offer all possible opportunities to said incumbents to assume duties and responsibilities in higher classifications consistent with the higher rates of compensation hereby continued. The salaries and wages paid to employees whose compensations are subject to the provisions of this section shall be those fixed in the schedule of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors as herein provided and in accord with the provisions of the ordinance of the board of supervisors adopting the said schedule, and the compensa-
tions set forth in the budget estimates, and the annual salary ordi-
nance and appropriations therefor shall be in accord therewith.

Not later than January 15th, 1944, and every five years there-
after and more often if in the judgment of the civil service com-
mission or the board of supervisors economic conditions have changed
to the extent that revision of existing schedules may be warranted
in order to reflect current prevailing conditions, the civil service
commission shall prepare and submit to the board of supervisors a
schedule of compensations as in this section provided. A schedule
of compensations or amendments thereto as provided herein which
is adopted by the board of supervisors on or before April 1st of any
year shall become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding
fiscal year and a schedule of compensations or amendments thereto
adopted by the board of supervisors after April 1st of any year shall
not become effective until the beginning of the second succeeding
fiscal year. The board of supervisors shall appropriate twelve
thousand five hundred dollars ($12,500) to the civil service com-
mission to be known as the salary survey fund and to be used ex-
clusively for defraying the cost of surveys of wages in private em-
ployment and in other governmental jurisdictions and making
reports and recommendations thereon and publication thereof as
herein provided. No expenditures shall be made therefrom except
on authorization of board of supervisors. In the event of the expend-
iture of any of said funds, the board of supervisors in the next suc-
ceeding annual budget shall appropriate a sum sufficient to reim-
burse said salary survey fund.

Where compensations for services commonly paid on an hourly
or a per diem basis are established on a weekly, semi-monthly or
monthly salary basis for city and county service, such salary shall
be based on the prevailing hourly or per diem rate, where this can
be established, and the application thereto of the normal or average
hours or days of actual working time, in the city and county service,
including an allowance for annual vacation.

Publication

Section 224. Whenever advertising or publication is required
by the provisions of this charter, it shall mean one publication in
each edition of the official newspaper of the city and county printed
and circulated in San Francisco on any one day, unless a greater
number of publications is specifically required; provided that
notices inviting bids shall be published for at least three consecu-
tive days, except as provided in section 95 of this charter.

The official newspaper is hereby defined to be a daily newspaper
of general circulation, published in the city and county and which
has a bona fide daily circulation of at least 8,000 copies. Whenever
the official newspaper is not able to publish and circulate for any
reason, the board of supervisors shall designate by resolution a
substitute medium or media designed to give reasonable publicity
in lieu of publication in the official newspaper, until such time as
the official newspaper resumes publication and circulation.

Ordered submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug.

Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales,
Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.
I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “O”
Vote Yes on “O”—Improve Public Notice of Legislative Action

Save Substantial Amounts of Taxpayers’ Money

Proposition “O” will create a vastly improved system of keeping the public informed about matters received, considered and acted upon by the Board of Supervisors and its committees:

Notices of proposed legislation and summaries of committees and Board agenda will be published in the daily press in advance of meetings.

Timely notices of action on legislation will be published at various stages of the cycle from introduction through final passage.

Added forms of public notice concerning proposed legislation will be used when desirable.

Copies of pending and proposed legislation will be made available to the public.

The new and improved system of notifying the public will supplant an extremely costly, unwieldy and relatively ineffective method carried over from the last century.

It will do away with publication of page after page of often technical, legislative text.

It will reduce publication costs by an estimated $100,000 annually.

The publisher of the “San Francisco Examiner,” current publisher of City newspaper advertising, has this to say: “If the City of San Francisco can find a less expensive way of meeting the requirements of the charter on the publication of Official Advertising, it should certainly do so. Perhaps the time has come for The City officials to take a long look at the aims and objectives of the single ‘public notices’ advertising. There should be a more efficient and economical way.”

The “more efficient and economical way” will be assured by a “Yes” vote on Proposition “O.”

Proposition “O”—Improved Service, Reduced Cost.

Vote YES on “O”

Sponsored by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “O”
Amends Section 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23, 72, 141, 147.1, 151 and 224, and
adds Section 10.1, relating to publication, printing and notices
relating to legislation and legislative meetings.
Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opin-
ion, the cost of government of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco would decrease not less than $107,747. Based on the 1971-1972
assessment roll, this estimated annual decrease is equivalent to
forty-six hundredths (.46) of one cent in the tax rate.
NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION P
Amends Section 171.1.5: Provides for retirement
allowance to widow upon death of fireman from
non-industrial causes after ten years of service.

CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION P
Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors
of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of
said city and county by amending Section 171.1.5 thereof, relating
to allowances payable on account of the deaths of members of the
Fire Department.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county
at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to
amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section
171.1.5 thereof, to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions are indicated by bold-face type.

Section 171.1.5. Upon the death of a member resulting from any
cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by perform-
ance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for ser-
vice retirement, under section 171.1.2, or after retirement for service
or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than
an injury received in, or illness caused by performance of duty,
three-fourths of his retirement allowance to which the member
would have been entitled if he had retired for service at the time of
death or three-fourths of the retirement allowance as it was at his
death, as the case may be, shall be continued throughout life or until
remarriage, to his surviving wife; or (b) if his death occurred after
retirement for disability by reason of injury received in or illness
caused by performance of duty, his retirement allowance as it was
at his death shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage,
to his surviving wife, except that, if death occurred prior to qual-
ification for service retirement allowance, the allowance continued
shall be adjusted upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been adjusted had the member not died, or (c) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in Section 171.1.9, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to Section 171.1.3 if he had retired on the date of death because of incapacity for performance of duty resulting from a cause other than bodily injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty shall be paid throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving wife. If there be no surviving wife entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if she die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving wife would have received had she lived and not remarried shall be paid to his child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies, or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. Should said member leave no surviving wife and no children under age of eighteen years, but leave a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving wife otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving wife unless she was married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death if he had not retired, or unless she was married to the member at least one year prior to his retirement.

As used in this section and section 171.1.4, “surviving wife” shall mean and include a surviving spouse, and shall also mean and include a spouse who has remarried since the death of the member but whose remarriage has been terminated by death, divorce or annulment within five years after the date of such remarriage and who has not thereafter again remarried.

The surviving wife, in the event of death of the member after qualification but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 171.1.7, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section. If there be no surviving wife, the guardian of the child or children under age eighteen, may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. Persons heretofore retired under charter section 171, as members of the fire department at the time of retirement, shall be subject to the provisions of this section. “Qualified for service retirement”, “Qualification for service retirement” or “Qualified as to age and service for retirement”, as used in this section and other sections to which persons who are members under section 171.1 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty-five years of service and attainment of age fifty, said service to be computed under section 171.1.9.


Ayes: Supervisors Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, von Beroldingen.
I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “P”

Proposition “P” corrects an oversight in Proposition “O” on the June 4th, 1968 ballot which omitted a retirement benefit affecting a small group in the Fire Department. This measure provides that if a fireman with ten (10) years of service is killed off-duty, his widow or dependent children or parents would continue to receive a portion of his retirement allowance, had he retired the day he died, (in lieu of Workmen’s Compensation benefits).

Fire Fighters and Police Officers are exempt from Social Security because of the terms of the National Social Security Act.

Sponsored by San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798.

Endorsed by:

Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Civil Service Association of San Francisco
Frank N. Alioto, President, Fire Commission
Rudy Tam, Vice President, Fire Commission
Morris Bernstein, Member, Fire Commission
Keith P. Calden, Chief of Fire Department
Municipal Improvement League, consisting of:
American Federation of Technical Engineers Local 17
Automotive Machinists Lodge No. 1305
Civil Service Association
Civil Service Building Maintenance Union Local 66A
Civil Service Per Diem Men’s Association of San Francisco
Cooks, Pastry Cooks & Assistants Local 44
Deputy Sheriffs’ Association Inc. of San Francisco
Hospital & Institutional Workers’ Union Local 250
International Union of Operating Engineers Stationary Local 39
Retired Employees of the City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco City and County Employees Union Local 400
San Francisco Classroom Teachers Association
San Francisco Federation of Teachers Local 61
San Francisco City and County Employees Local 747
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798
San Francisco Police Officers Association
San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association Inc.
Staff Council Bureau of Public Health Nursing
San Francisco Building & Construction Trades Council
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
Teamsters Local 85

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk.

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “P”

Amends Section 171.1.5: Provides for retirement allowance to widow upon death of fireman from non-industrial causes after ten years of service.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on
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a report by the Retirement System, in my opinion, the cost of government of the City and County of San Francisco would be increased by approximately $47,053 annually. Based on the 1971-1972 assessment roll, this estimated annual increase is equivalent to twenty hundredths (.20) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION Q

Amends Section 119.3: Provides for minimum schedules and maximum fares on cable car lines.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION Q

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 119.3 thereof, relating to operation of cable cars.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 119.3 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

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

OPERATION OF CABLE CARS

Section 119.3. In the conduct of the municipal railway there shall be maintained and operated cable car lines as follows:

1. A line commencing at Powell and Market Streets; thence along Powell Street to Jackson Street; thence along Jackson Street to Mason Street; thence along Mason Street to Columbus Avenue; thence along Columbus Avenue to Taylor Street; thence along Taylor Street to a terminal at Bay Street; returning from Bay and Taylor Streets along Taylor Street to Columbus Avenue; thence along Columbus Avenue to Mason Street; thence along Mason Street to Washington Street; thence along Washington Street to Powell Street; and thence along Powell Street to Market Street, the point of commencement.

2. A line commencing at Powell and Market Streets; thence along Powell Street to Jackson Street; thence along Jackson Street to Hyde Street; thence along Hyde Street to a terminal at Beach, returning from Beach and Hyde Streets along Hyde Street to Washington Street; thence along Washington Street to Powell Street; thence along Powell Street to Market Street, the point of commencement.

3. A line commencing at Market and California; thence along California Street to a terminal at Van Ness Avenue, returning from Van Ness Avenue along California Street to Market Street, the point of commencement.

139
((Notwithstanding the provisions of section 74 of the charter the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, to provide $855,820 from any funds certified by the controller to be legally available for capital costs to accomplish the purpose of this section and it shall, for the fiscal year 1955-1956, levy a tax to provide any portion thereof not theretofore provided.))

((The amounts realized from the sale or disposition of that certain parcel of real property situated at the southwest corner of California and Hyde Streets shall be made available for capital costs for the purpose of this section, and shall be in addition to the amount specified in the preceding paragraph.))

((Proposed expenditures for capital costs in excess of the amounts hereinabove specifically provided for shall be subject to the provisions of section 74 of the charter.))

To fully effectuate the intent of this section respecting the cable car lines designated in 1, 2 and 3 above, the public utilities commission shall maintain and operate said lines at the normal levels of scheduling and service in effect on July 1, 1971; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the commission from increasing at any time the said levels of scheduling and service.

The fare on any cable car line shall not exceed the local fare established under the provisions of section 130 of this charter for other types of carrier equipment employed in the operation of the San Francisco municipal railway.


No: Supervisor Mailliard.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "Q"

Five times in the past the people of San Francisco have voted to retain their cable cars. In 1954 they voted in the present system, believing that the remaining cable cars would thereafter be "saved."

Recently an attempt was made to cut service drastically, which led to strong disapproval throughout the city and across the country. This proved emphatically the urgent need to plug a loophole left in the 1954 charter amendment by requiring adequate service to be maintained. This is the primary purpose of the present charter amendment, which will guarantee that service on the cable car lines will be maintained at least at the level in effect on July 1, 1971.

This date was chosen because service has been maintained at that level for more than 2 years through all seasons, and it is felt that this is the minimum service which can be considered adequate.

It also insures that a premium fare will not be charged on the cable cars. From time to time a higher fare has been considered, but this would be unfair to the many San Franciscans who use them as normal transportation.

Cable cars are the symbol and trademark of San Francisco. They
have been designated a National Landmark—the only one of its kind. A cable car stamp is being issued this year.

As a San Francisco newspaper once said, "San Francisco could not buy an asset like the cable cars if it had all the money in the world, and it could not think up a better one if it had all the brains in the world."

Cable cars are the outstanding tourist attraction of San Francisco—and tourism and conventions are the number one source of income to our city. Last year the amount was some $267,500,000. Cable cars generate more jobs than any other fixed asset. Hotels, restaurants, stores, services, and many businesses all benefit.

So vote Yes on this amendment. It guarantees good service at regular fares. Keep the cable the San Francisco label.

Endorsed by:
Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Janet Aitken
Harold B. Brooks, Jr.
The Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
Citizens Committee to Save the Cable Cars
Citizens' Planning Committee
Marion Hinman
Mrs. Hans Klussmann
Gordon Lau
Market Street Development Project
The Mexican-American Political Association
Nob Hill Association
Nob Hill Properties, Inc.
Potrero Hill Residents and Homeowners Council
San Francisco Labor Council
George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council
San Francisco Tomorrow
Anna H. Thayer
Beverly A. Willis

I hereby certify that the Board of Supervisors endorsed the foregoing argument, and authorized its inclusion in the ballot pamphlet for the November 2, 1971, election by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "Q"

The Cable Cars have long been a part of the history and tradition of San Francisco, and comprise the City's most unique and well-known tourist attraction. I am not against the Cable Cars. I am against Proposition "Q," which would be a vote for political domination of the Cable Cars. One reason Cable Cars lose so much money yearly, (9.04% of the annual MUNI deficit or two million dollars), is that they have been controlled by pressure groups and politicians. Proposition "Q" would lock-in Cable Car fares and schedules as a permanent part of the Charter, thereby making them a political pawn. I don't want this to happen. I am a native San Franciscan, and know and appreciate the Cable Cars, but they must be controlled and operated by transportation experts.

Few people realize the cost of the Cable Cars to the taxpayers of San Francisco. In lawsuits of the last five years, the City has paid out over $1.3 million; currently, there is over $14 million in pending litigation against the City from accidents directly related
to the operation of Cable Cars. The Cable Cars travel less than 2% of the total MUNI mileage, carry less than 6% of the total passengers, and yet they experience over 11% of the MUNI accidents, over 13% of the fatalities, and over 18% of the costs of settling claims. Cable Cars also experience over three times as many accidents per 100,000 miles as other MUNI-operated equipment. Add to these costs a proposal by Supervisor Dianne Feinstein which would extend a new Cable Car line from California Street to Ghirardelli Square on Polk Street. The MUNI cost projections for this new service run over six million dollars, (not including interest, sewer, gas and electric hookups, etc.). The experts say "No"—the politicians say "Yes."

The Cable Cars are currently run by the MUNI Railway under the direction of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The PUC sets fares and regulates schedules for the Cable Cars, adjusting these schedules to meet peak hours during the tourist season and slack hours during the winter. By making these adjustments, the City saves over $600,000 annually. These savings will be Lost if Proposition "Q" is passed and the cost passed on to the taxpayer who already pays for the huge $20 million MUNI deficit.

The PUC and the MUNI are Not trying to eliminate the Cable Cars. They are only cutting back on Cable Car service when there are few passengers and increasing service when it is needed. Vote "No" on Proposition "Q." Control of the Cable Cars must remain with the transportation experts on the Public Utilities Commission, not with the politicians.

I am not against the Cable Cars. I believe they truly reflect the charm and grace of San Francisco. But Cable Cars must be controlled by transportation experts, not politicians, so that their beauty and grace can best be utilized. The Cable Cars must have constant control and supervision to achieve their maximum efficiency. The Board of Supervisors, currently, has neither the time nor the experience to effectively manage the Cable Car system. The Public Utilities Commission does.

For these reasons, I urge a "No" vote on Proposition "Q."

JOHN J. BARBAGELATA, Supervisor
City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "Q"

Vote No on "Q" Don't Tie the Hands of Municipal Railway Management!

Prop. "Q" would freeze cable car service at not less than that prevailing on July 1 this year. This does not belong in the charter. Management must have discretion to adapt services to meet demand.

The Utilities Commission is attempting to improve the cable car system—this measure would hamstring the Commission. Vote No on "Q."

This argument sponsored by the following members of The San Francisco Municipal Conference:
Apartment House Asns. Consolidated, Inc. Down Town Assn., S.F.
Building Owners and Managers Assn. S.F. Real Estate Board
Lloyd E. Graybiel, Chairman
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "Q"

Vote No on this ill-conceived Charter amendment. It would deny San Francisco taxpayers the benefits of prudent cable car scheduling.

This proposition would open the door to higher taxes by prohibiting reduced winter schedules when cable car riding falls off because of rain and cold weather or other reasons. The Muni, an essential public service, will require $20,000,000 in tax support this year. That does not mean that we should spend money needlessly. This amendment would lock management into an inflexible situation.

Vote No on this proposition! It is based on misleading propaganda that our internationally famous cable car system is endangered.

GEORGE F. HANSEN
JOHN A. SUTRO
ARCH MONSON JR.
BRUCE A. BLINN
RICHARD N. GOLDMAN
THOMAS O. CAYLOR
DONALD MAGNIN

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183 PROPOSITION "Q"

Amends Section 119.3: Provides for minimum schedules and maximum fares on cable car lines.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on operating schedules of cable cars in effect during the fiscal year 1970-1971 compared with such schedules in effect July 1, 1971, in my opinion, the cost of government of the City and County of San Francisco would not be affected. The proposed amendment forbids any reduction in cable car operating schedules which reduction, if adopted, could decrease the cost of government of the City and County of San Francisco with a resultant decrease in the tax rate, the amount of which, being dependent on future administrative action, cannot be estimated at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION R

Shall the Proposed Recodified Charter for the City and County of San Francisco Be Adopted?

PROPOSITION R

Describing and setting forth a proposal for charter recodification for the City and County of San Francisco.

Pursuant to Resolution No. 493-71, set forth in full hereinbelow, and in accordance with the provisions of Section 34461.5 of the Government Code of the State of California, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to
the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal for charter recodification.

"RESOLUTION NO. 493-71
APPROVING AND ADOPTING PROPOSAL FOR CHARTER RECODIFICATION AND SUBMITTING SAME TO ELECTORS OF CITY AND COUNTY.

"WHEREAS, Section 34461.5 of the Government Code of the State of California provides, in part, that the governing body of a city and county may, on its own motion, recodify the charter of said city and county and by resolution submit the proposal for charter recodification to the electors of said city and county, provided such recodification does not, in any manner, substantially change the provisions of said charter; and

"WHEREAS, The San Francisco Citizens' Charter Revision Committee has submitted to this Board of Supervisors a proposal for charter recodification which does not, in any manner, substantially change the provisions of said charter; now, therefore, be it

"RESOLVED, That this Board of Supervisors hereby approves and adopts the proposal for charter recodification submitted to said Board by the San Francisco Citizens' Charter Revision Committee; and be it

"FURTHER RESOLVED, That, pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of Section 34461.5 of the Government Code of the State of California, this Board of Supervisors hereby submits to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, said proposal for charter recodification."

Adopted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 13, 1971.

Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Boas, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
JOSEPH L. ALIOTO, Mayor

(Explanatory note: The following text has been submitted and recommended by the San Francisco Citizens Charter Revision Committee, and is set forth as Section 11.104 of the proposed recodified charter:

"It is the purpose of the voters of the City and County by this enactment merely to recodify and re-enact without substantive change, all provisions of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco which took effect January 8, 1932, as amended from time to time, except as provisions of that charter have been omitted from the recodification because they are obsolete. In case of any inconsistency arising through omission or otherwise between the provisions of any section of this recodified Charter and the corresponding portion of the Charter of January 8, 1932, as amended, effect shall be given for all purposes whatsoever to the portion of the Charter of January 8, 1932, as amended.

"If in the election of November 2, 1971, any other proposition and this Proposition R, providing for a recodified charter, both
receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, then not-
withstanding the provisions of section 185 of the Charter, the pro-
visions of any such other Proposition shall be incorporated into the 
recodified charter, so adopted, and the City Attorney shall affix 
numbers and titles as he considers appropriate."

PROPOSITION 5

Amends Sections 5, 49 and 134: Provides for Election 
at Large of Members of Board of Education.

CHARTER AMENDMENT 
PROPOSITION 5

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors 
of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of 
said City and County by amending Sections 549 and 134 relating to 
an elective board of education.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco 
hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at 
an election to be held therein on November 2, 1971, a proposal to 
amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Sections 
549 and 134 so that the same shall read as follows:

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

CHARTER AMENDMENT 
PROPOSITION 5

Section 5. The Mayor, the members of the board of supervisors, 
an assessor, a district attorney, a city attorney, a sheriff, a treasurer, 
a public defender, and ((municipal court judges)) commencing with 
a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct pri-
mary in 1972, the members of the board of education shall be elected 
at large by the voters of the city and county.

At the general municipal election in 1943, and at the general mu-
cipal election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected 
a mayor, six supervisors, a district attorney and a sheriff, and at the 
general municipal election in 1945, and at the general municipal 
election in every fourth year thereafter, there shall be elected five 
supervisors, a city attorney, and a treasurer, and at the general elec-
tion in 1942, and at the general election in every fourth year there-
after there shall be elected an assessor and a public defender. At a 
special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary 
in 1972 seven members of the board of education shall be elected at 
large. All of the aforesaid officials except as set forth herein, shall be 
elected for a term of four years, from the commencement of their 
respective terms as herein specified. ((The term of the assessor who 
shall hold office on the 8th day of January, 1943, shall expire at 
twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the person elected assessor at 
the general election in 1942, shall succeed to said office at twelve 
o'clock noon on said 8th day of January 1943. 
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At the general municipal election in 1943, there shall be elected four municipal court judges to succeed those judges whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1944, and at the general municipal election in each sixth year after 1943 the successors to said four municipal court judges shall be elected, and at the general municipal election in 1945 there shall be elected four municipal court judges to succeed those judges whose respective terms of office expire on January 8, 1946, and at the general municipal election in each sixth year after 1945, the successors to said last mentioned judges shall be elected, and at the general municipal election in 1947, there shall be elected four municipal court judges to succeed those judges whose respective terms of office expire on the 8th day of January, 1948, and at the general municipal election on each sixth year after 1947, the successors to said last mentioned judges shall be elected. The term of each municipal court judge shall be six years from and after twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following his election. All terms of office of elective officials shall begin at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January following the date of their election.

((Any appointive officer or employee of the city and county who shall become a candidate for election by the people to any public office shall automatically forfeit such city and county office or position.))

The respective terms of the members of the board of education who shall hold office on the 8th day of August, 1972, shall expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, and the persons elected as members of the board of education at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972 shall succeed to said offices at twelve o'clock noon on said 8th day of August, 1972. The respective terms of office of the members of the board of education elected at a special municipal election to be consolidated with the direct primary in 1972, shall be as follows: The four members receiving the highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1977; the three members receiving the next highest number of votes respectively at said election shall hold office for a term consisting of the period of time until the 8th day of January, 1975. Thereafter the term of each member elected to the board of education shall be four years from the commencement of his term as herein specified.

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

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

((Should this amendment not be approved by the Legislature of
the State of California so that the office of assessor may be voted for
at the general election to be held in November, 1942, as in this section
provided, then in that event the term of the incumbent in the office
of assessor at twelve o'clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1943,
shall not expire at twelve o'clock noon on said date, but shall con-
tinue until the 8th day of January, 1944, and the office of assessor
shall be filled at the general municipal election in 1943, for a three
year term from said date, and said office of assessor shall again be
filled at the general election in 1946 for a four year term from said
date, and at the general election in each fourth year thereafter.))

APPOINTMENTS ((AND NOMINATIONS)) BY THE MAYOR

Section 49. The mayor shall ((nominate members of the board
of education for confirmation by the voters, and shall)) appoint three
members of the retirement board, and shall also appoint members of
the public utilities, city planning and civilservice commissions, each
of which said boards or commissions to have the membership, terms
of members, and powers and duties as are provided in this charter.

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Section 134. All of the public schools of the school district of the
city and county shall be under the control and management of a
board of education, composed of seven commissioners, who, com-
mencing with a special municipal election to be consolidated with
the direct primary in 1972, shall be ((nominated by the mayor and
be subject to confirmation or rejection by vote of the electors as in
this section provided,)) elected at large by the voters of the city and
county and who shall be subject to recall, and to suspensions and
removal in the same manner as elective officers, as provided by this
charters. ((The term of each member shall be five years, commencing
on the 8th day of January following their respective nominations,
provided that each such five-year term shall begin at the expiration
of the respective terms of members as existing at the time this
charter shall go into effect.)) The compensation of each member
shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month.

((Nominations of members of the board of education shall be
made, subject to confirmation by the electors, by the filing by the
mayor, with the registrar of voters between the first and tenth day of
September in each year prior to the expiration of the term or terms
of members, the name of one qualified citizen, or two, as the case
may be, to serve as a member or members, respectively, of said board
for the regular term or terms commencing on the 8th day of January
in the succeeding year. Each nominee, not later than forty-five days
prior to the election at which the electors vote to confirm or reject
said nominee, shall file with the registrar a statement of qualifica-
tions in not to exceed one hundred words, subscribed by him before
the registrar. The registrar shall forthwith certify to the said sub-
scription and its date and retain and file the statement. The registrar
shall cause said statement of qualifications to be printed and shall
mail a copy of the same to each voter, at least five days prior to the
election. This printed copy may be attached to any other matter
required to be printed and mailed.))
((The form of ballot shall be as provided in section 184 of this charter and if a majority of the qualified electors voting on said nomination or nominations shall vote in favor thereof, said nomination shall be confirmed and the person or persons named shall take office on the 8th day of January next following. If a majority of the electors vote “No,” the nomination shall stand rejected, and such persons shall not be eligible for nomination as a member of the board of education for a period of at least three years. If a majority of the electors vote “No,” the mayor shall appoint a qualified citizen to serve as a member of the board until the 8th day of January following the next general election or general municipal election, whichever shall first be held. Between the first and tenth day of September before such general election or general municipal election, the mayor shall nominate, subject to confirmation by the electors at such election, as herein provided, a qualified citizen to serve as a member of the board for the remainder of the five-year term for which the nomination first made by the mayor was rejected.) Vacancies (otherwise) occurring on said board shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired terms.


Ayes: Supervisors Barbagelata, Driscoll, Feinstein, Francois, Gonzales, Mailliard, Mendelsohn, Pelosi, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “S”

Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

Let the people elect members of the Board of Education. Passage of Proposition “S” will give the voters the right to elect members of the Board of Education. Vote Yes on “S.”

Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

San Francisco is the only school district in California where school board members are appointed and not elected by the people at large by popular vote. Also, every city on the West Coast elects its school board. Vote Yes on “S.”

Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

Passage of Proposition “S” will give the voters the right in the June 1972 primary election to elect an entirely new seven-member Board of Education who would then take office in August 1972. Vote Yes on “S.”

Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

The Board of Education now spends approximately 38% of all the moneys collected by the City and County of San Francisco from ad valorem taxes (real estate, and personal property taxes). The Board of Education should be responsible to the entire community and work together in the best interests of all of our children and all the taxpayers, not just particular segments of our City. Members should not owe allegiance to any particular neighborhood, ward or election district. Vote Yes on “S.”
Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

No issue should receive a higher priority than the education of our children. Proposition “S” directly concerns the education of our children. Proposition “S” was placed on the ballot by the efforts of thousands of your friends and neighbors who sacrificed their time to secure 75,000 signatures on a petition which forced the Board of Supervisors to place this issue before the voters. On three occasions during the past eighteen months Charter amendments giving the electorate the right to vote whether or not the Board of Education should be elected by popular vote came before the Board of Supervisors. Your right to vote on this issue was denied by the political maneuvers of a faction of Supervisors, in liason with advocates of forced busing of elementary school children and members of the Board of Education. Twice last year and once this year by a vote of 6 to 5, certain supervisors denied you your right to vote on this important issue. The Board of Supervisors was mandated in November 1969 to give the community this right when the electorate endorsed Proposition “Q” declaring that the Board of Education shall be elected. Never in the history of our city have so many San Franciscans been so dissatisfied, disillusioned and distrustful with the policies and actions of our Board of Education. Our School Board continually ignores the will of the people and has been negligent in its responsibilities to our children. Millions of dollars have been mis-spent. Our children are not securing a quality education. The Board of Education, to be effective, must have the support and confidence of parents, teachers and taxpayers. Let your voices be heard.

Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

Don’t be misled by opponents of Proposition “S.” Campaign expenditures of candidates can be limited to a nominal sum by State action. Qualified candidates may be chosen and screened by representatives of responsible neighborhood groups and organizations. An at-large election of school board members will not eliminate minority representation. Dr. Riles, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is a member of a minority group who last year overwhelmingly defeated his opponent Dr. Rafferty in San Francisco by a vote of 140,000 to 83,000. We need a change. Don’t be misled.

Vote Yes on Proposition “S”

SUPERVISOR JOHN J. BARBAGELATA

LIST OF ENDORSERS OF PROPOSITION “S”

Hon. Joseph L. Alioto, Mayor
Assemblyman Leo T. McCarthy
Supervisor Peter Tamaras
Supervisor James Mailliard
Supervisor Dorothy von Beroldingen
Supervisor Michael Driscoll
Harold Dobbs
Quentin L. Kopp
John L. Molinari
Robert G. Nelson
Classroom Teachers Association
United Community of Geneva-Excelsior
San Francisco Chinese Parents Committee
Citizens for Good Government
Concerned Parents Association
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "S"
Elected School Board

Vote No because San Francisco's worst Boards of Education and most ineffective educational programs occurred during the 50 years we had an elected Board.

Vote No because there has been no careful citizen study of alternative methods to select a Board of Education.

Vote No because members of the Board of Education must be free from politics and not obligated to the groups who finance their campaigns.

Vote No because San Francisco's children deserve Board members firmly committed to public education. Capable and dedicated citizens, willing to accept appointment to the Board, might not choose to undergo the ordeal and high cost of a political campaign.

Vote No because right now the Board of Education represents the community—no ethnic, economic, religious or social group dominates. Changing to an elected Board does not guarantee improvement—probably the reverse. (No member of a minority group has been elected on an at-large basis to the Board of Supervisors unless first appointed.)

Vote No because right now the voters can reject the Mayor's nominee by voting No on the ballot; and voters now control the Board of Education's power to raise taxes since they must approve a tax override.

League of Women Voters of San Francisco
Kathryn S. Blalock, President
N.A.A.C.P., Benjamin Criswell, President
Parents for Community Schools,
Sandra E. Taylor, Pres.
SCOPE, Benjamin Tom, President
Stephen S. Weiner, Vice Pres., SCOPE
Democratic Women's Forum,
Carolyn S. Silverman, Pres.
Education Com. Chinatown-North Beach Dist.
Council, Betty Lim Gulmaraes, President
Ethnic Minority Coalition,
Yvonne S. Golden, President
PROPOSITION T

Initiative Ordinance: Repeals Sections 275, 276, 280-287 inclusive, 290-296.4 inclusive; adds Section 275; re-enacts Sections 250-264 inclusive, Part II, Chapter II, San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code), relating to building heights within the City and County of San Francisco.

PROPOSITION T

The people of the City and County of San Francisco hereby propose a zoning ordinance limiting the height of buildings in San Francisco, as follows:

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

Section 1. The People of the City and County of San Francisco (the "City") hereby find and declare that it is in the best interests of the City to preserve the natural beauty of the land, the sky and the waters of the City for the enjoyment and pleasure of its citizens and visitors, and for all people for all time; and that it is in the best interest of the City to protect against the danger of falling debris and collapse of tall buildings during earthquakes.

Section 2. Article 2.5 of Part II, Chapter II, San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom Sections 275, 276 and 280 through and including 287 and 290 through and including 296.4; and adding a new Section 275 reading as follows:

SEC. 275. No building, whether owned by private parties, the City or any agency or political subdivision thereof, higher than the lesser of six stories or 72 feet shall be permitted to be built in the City.

Section 3. Sections 250 through and including 264 of the City Planning Code, as in effect at midnight October 1, 1970, are incorporated herein and hereby made a part hereof.

Section 4. This ordinance may be amended or repealed only by vote of the majority of voters on the question in a general or special election.

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION T

Vote Yes on T.

Are High-Rise Buildings Necessary?

No. Dozens of European cities have height limits and are very good places to live. Paris, Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Geneva and many others have kept a human-scale—and they are economically healthier than New York, Chicago, or San Francisco.

Are High-Rise Buildings Beautiful?

Some people like them and some don’t. But even the people who like them don’t like all of them. And that is what Proposition T is about. If you like a building, you can vote for it and if it passes the test of the voters, then it will be built. The situation now is that the real-estate promoters decide what they want to do. Yes on T
means that the people who live in the City will decide what is best for the City.

Do High-Rise Buildings Cause Smog?

Yes. Office buildings with jobs mainly for commuters plus homes in the suburbs plus cars to go-back and forth equals smog. In the last five years jobs for San Franciscans have not increased, but jobs for commuters have gone up 23%. Not all of the commuters drive to work, but most of them do. BART will, of course, help but even with BART the total number of cars coming into the City will increase (unless the voters of the City vote Yes on T) increasing the pressure to build more freeways and more bridges. 23% more jobs for commuters plus another, say, 23% in the next five years will also mean more pollution from sewage in the Bay, more crowding, more noise, more of everything that San Franciscans don’t want.

Do High-Rise Buildings Lower Taxes?

The real estate interests, the big-business people, and almost everyone in City Hall says that tall buildings are needed to lower taxes. Yet when they are asked to point out one case, not only in California or the United States, but anywhere in the world, where the construction of a tall building led to a lowering of property taxes, they are unable to do so. In their fight against Proposition T the business interests have financed several studies which claim that high-rise buildings lower taxes. The sponsors of these studies were asked if they had ever commissioned a study that did not supply the conclusion that had been expected by the people who paid for the study. They never did. Studies paid for by real-estate promoters come to conclusions that support real-estate interests.

A study recently done by the San Francisco Bay Guardian—which has no financial interest in promoting any point of view—pointed out that the high-density downtown district brought in $62.9 million but cost $67.7 million in tax-paid city services. This is why taxes on home owners are going up and rents on apartments are rising. The more we build, the poorer we get. Yes on T will keep us from becoming as broke as they are in New York.

Are High-Rise Buildings Safe in Earthquakes?

Some seismologists say they are and some say they aren’t and nobody knows for sure. The recent quake in Los Angeles showed that new high-rise buildings come through better than old low-rise. But the Los Angeles quake was very mild by San Francisco standards, and the epicenter was 35 miles from the high-rise district. If we are ever hit with a quake of 1906 intensity, that quake would be two points higher on the Richter scale and two points higher means that the release of energy would be 900 times the release of energy in Los Angeles. Until we really know what would happen, it may not make sense to pile up more and more people in San Francisco.

Will a Yes on T Change the Urban Design Plan?

Yes. The Urban Design Plan which opens up much more of the City to high-rise development would have to be modified if there is a Yes vote on T. But the Urban Design Plan was nullified anyway by the action of the Planning Commission in approving the 25-story Holiday Inn on Van Ness Avenue—the largest Holiday Inn in the world. This was the first case to be considered after acceptance of
the Urban Design Plan, and the Planning Commission violated the plan to serve the economic interests of the developers. So even people who like the Urban Design Plan should vote Yes on T so that if any plan is finally adopted, that plan will have some teeth in it.

**Do High-Rise Buildings Create Jobs?**

They do create jobs for commuters which is of course nice for them. But San Franciscans shouldn’t have to pay more taxes and give up the good thing that the City has been in order to provide jobs for commuters. There are of course some menial service jobs in high-rise offices and hotels that go to San Franciscans—particularly minorities. But what is needed for minorities and all San Franciscans is higher paying jobs with a chance for advancement. The rush to high-rise must be stopped in order to attract to the City the kind of businesses that will employ the people who live in San Francisco. Only if we take the decision-making power back into our own hands will be be able to build a happy and prosperous city.

**Vote Yes on T**

Proposition T has been endorsed by the following individuals and organizations:

Committee for a Vote on High-Rise
Alvin Duskin
San Francisco Tomorrow
Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
Veterans Political Council
Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Bay Area Campus Republicans
Cable Car Republican Assembly
North Beach-Nob Hill Republican Assembly

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “T”**

**Vote No on Proposition “T”**

PropONENTS of Proposition “T” have made headlines with wild, undocumented charges about the problems allegedly caused by high-rise buildings. The simple truth is that if this dangerous measure is approved, San Franciscans will face a drastically increased property tax rate. The burden of this increase will not fall on the business community—in fact, many business properties will receive big tax breaks as a result of lowered assessments. Homeowners and renters will be hardest hit, but the entire community will suffer if Proposition “T” is approved.

Vote No on Proposition “T.” Don’t be misled by wild, undocumented charges.

Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
John P. Greenagel, Manager
Public Affairs Department

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “T”**

**Vote No on Proposition “T”—“T” Means Trouble**

San Francisco has many serious problems which must be solved. The problems we face must be met with carefully reasoned solutions, not drastic, irrational actions. Proposition “T” is an example of drastic, irrational action that could seriously harm the future of all San Franciscans.
If adopted, Proposition “T” would prohibit the construction of any new building taller than six stories or 72 feet, whichever is less, without a specific vote of the people. In effect, such a requirement would amount to a total ban on new construction of buildings taller than six stories. Such a ban would mean virtual strangulation for San Francisco. It would mean a loss of jobs, drastically increased taxes, more pollution, more congestion, and fewer opportunities for jobs for San Franciscans.

**Vote No on Proposition “T”—“T” Is the Tax Trap Initiative**

The City Controller has estimated that passage of Proposition “T” would result in an immediate property tax increase of 48 cents per $100 of assessed valuation and an additional increase of $1.44 per $100 of assessed valuation over the next ten years. This would ultimately mean a property tax increase of $96 a year to the owner of a home valued at $20,000 and proportionately more to those whose homes are valued higher. San Franciscans who rent their homes or apartments would have to pay higher rents to make up for the tax increase.

A property tax increase would be necessary because Proposition “T” would force the assessor to lower the assessed valuation of many properties in San Francisco. Homeowners and renters would have to make up the loss in revenues to the City.

**Vote No on Proposition “T”—“T” Means Traffic Congestion**

San Francisco is unique among American cities. San Francisco has a compact downtown commercial district which allows shoppers, businessmen, and visitors to walk from place to place and to use public transportation—cable cars, buses, streetcars, and eventually BART—to move about without relying on private automobiles. By contrast, Los Angeles is a sprawling city without a dense, convenient core area. One of the reasons Los Angeles sprawled out the way it did was the existence of a thirteen-story height limitation until very recently. As a result, development spread over a large area, creating demands for freeways and causing heavy reliance on automobiles. Proposition “T” would force San Francisco to sprawl outward, destroying open space, causing congestion, and increasing air pollution.

**Vote No on Proposition “T”—“T” Means Tragedy for Job-Seekers**

Passage of Proposition “T” would have many ill effects upon the long-range economy of the City. Obviously, the first to be hurt would be those employed in the construction industry. But in the longer range, everyone would suffer. As office space becomes more scarce, the stronger, more powerful business firms would drive out the smaller, struggling businesses. While most employees who already have jobs would remain employed, those who do not have jobs would find it much more difficult to find jobs. Minorities, who are just now beginning to find acceptance in “white collar” jobs, would suffer most from the shrinkage of the job market, thus increasing the welfare burden.

**Vote No on Proposition “T”—“T” Is a Time Bomb for San Franciscans**

Proposition “T” is literally a “time bomb” for the City. Perhaps it would not appear to be a destructive limitation at first. But each
year the property tax rate would have to be increased as a result of lowered property values downtown. Each year it would be increasingly difficult for young persons entering the job market to find jobs in San Francisco. Each year more struggling businesses—especially small businesses—would find it impossible to survive in San Francisco.

Citizens for San Francisco is an organization of community leaders, labor, business, and neighborhood groups. Please join with us in opposing Proposition “T.” Vote NO on Proposition “T”—the tragic one.

CITIZENS FOR SAN FRANCISCO
The Honorable Joseph G. Kennedy, CHAIRMAN
Advisory Committee Members
The Honorable John J. Barbagelata
Mrs. Lily M. Budde
Mrs. Arthur Caylor
William Chester
The Honorable Michael J. Driscoll
Kenneth Edwards
James T. Feehan
The Honorable Terry A. Francois
The Honorable Robert E. Gonzales
Mrs. Thomas C. Lynch
The Honorable James Mailliard
Mrs. Osceola (Washington) Means
The Honorable Robert H. Mendelsohn
The Honorable Peter Tamaras
The Honorable Dorothy von Beroldingen
Miss Marguerite Warren
T. W. Washington
Mrs. Elouise Westbrook
Alan S. Wong

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “T”
Vote No on Proposition “T”—T is Thoughtless
Think of San Francisco without the Ferry Building. Without Coit Tower. Without Grace Cathedral. Without the Top of the Mark. They’re all taller than six stories.
Not every tall building is ugly. Or every short building handsome. Consider L.A.

Vote No on Proposition “T”—T is Taxes, More and Higher
Without our downtown office buildings, we’d pay higher taxes. Much higher taxes.
The Assessor says the 100 largest buildings in San Francisco pay $30 million in property taxes each year.
Think about this: In Utica, N.Y., where there are few tall buildings, property taxes are twice as high as San Francisco’s!

Vote No on Proposition “T”—T is Trenton, New Jersey (or similar)
There are few high-rises in Trenton, New Jersey.
Just mile after mile of low-rise sameness.
Empty low-rise warehouses and factories. Abandoned apartment buildings. And a bankrupt economy.
Don’t let them Trentonize San Francisco.
Vote No on Proposition "T"—T is Tainted

Don't let them scare you about earthquakes either.
In the L.A. earthquake last Spring, all of the new tall buildings stood. Older, low buildings fell down.
It's as simple as that. Old buildings fall in earthquakes. New buildings have the best chance of standing. Short or tall.

Vote No on Proposition "T"—T is Trouble

Jobs are already hard to get.
If San Francisco goes low-rise only, they'll be even harder to get, especially for minorities. For San Francisco is a "headquarters" city for West Coast offices of big, national firms.
Firms thinking of coming to San Francisco will go to L.A. instead.
Consider: The building of Yerba Buena Center alone downtown will mean 30,000 office, construction, hotel and service jobs.

Vote No on Proposition "T"—T would be Tragic

Proposition T—to limit all future buildings in San Francisco to six stories—is a simple solution to a complex problem. It's throwing the baby out with the bath water.
Sure, some of our recent downtown buildings are disgraceful. Particularly the darker ones and the bulky ones that block views.
But what's needed is an historic and unique Urban Design Plan, which plans for and controls the color, size, bulk and height of buildings throughout the City.
And that's what we just approved only a few weeks ago. So there's no need for T.

SAN FRANCISCO JOINT ILWU LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
KEITH EICKMAN, Secretary

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "T"
Vote No on "T" Don't Put San Francisco in a Straightjacket!

Prop. "T" would put a 72-foot ceiling on buildings in San Francisco, except as voted by the electorate. This arbitrary restriction would stifle growth and raise taxes throughout the city.
Officials estimate the tax rate would be 48 cents higher if Prop. "T" had been in effect this year. In ten years the rate would go up to $1.44 if "T" were in effect according to these estimates.
The Planning Commission has spent much time and money on an Urban Design Plan. This plan is far preferable to a 72-foot limit which could have disastrous aesthetic, economic and social effects. Vote No on "T"!

This argument sponsored by the following members of The San Francisco Municipal Conference:
Apartment House Assns. Consolidated, Inc. S.F. Junior Chamber
Building Owners & Managers Assn. of Commerce
Down Town Association, S.F. S.F. Real Estate Board
Retail Dry Goods Assn.

Lloyd E. Graybiel, Chairman

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION T
Vote No on Proposition T

Proposition T will not do what its proponents say it will; instead it would be damaging to the City's future. If "T" is approved it will
cause your taxes and rents to go up. Don't be fooled by the proponents emotional, illogical, and unsubstantiated claims. Vote No on Proposition T.

DOWNTOWN ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO
RUSSELL D. KEIL, President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION T

A majority of San Francisco voters must vote No on Proposition T. If they do not—taxes and most probably rents will increase for all city residents, thousands of needed jobs will be lost, other cities will draw our middle income families, Bay Area Rapid Transit will have proved to be a ten-year waste.

These conclusions have been made after extensive study and investigation which exposed Proposition T to be unjustifiable, regressive and ill-conceived.

We urge the only reasonable vote possible—No on Proposition T.

Official Position of the San Francisco
Real Estate Board
Richard J. Loughlin
Executive Vice President

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "T"

Vote "No" on "T"—Defeat This Arbitrary Proposal!

The so-called Duskin Proposal to limit the heights of future buildings in the Downtown area of San Francisco is an ill-conceived petition to limit heights of buildings to six stories or 72 feet whichever is the lesser.

Other major cities such as Chicago, Los Angeles and Houston have removed limitations on building heights in order to build greater metropolitan areas. This proposal would discourage new business and industry from coming to our city.

Assessor Joseph Tinney has indicated that the tax consequences of the Duskin Initiative would be critical. He has publicly stated that to restrict development of property in the core area could result in a downward reassessment of prime commercial land and other downtown properties.

Our present zoning laws are sufficiently restrictive to control future building. We urge a No vote on this petition which would limit the heights of buildings in San Francisco.

Building Owners & Managers Assn. of S. F.
By F. J. Sitek, President

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO
CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "T"

Initiative Ordinance: Repeals Sections 275, 276, 280-287 inclusive, 290-290.4 inclusive; adds Section 275; re-enacts Sections 250-264 inclusive, Part II, Chapter II, San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code), relating to building heights within the City and County of San Francisco.

Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government of the City and County of San Francisco.
Based on a report by the Assessor, it is my opinion that real property assessments immediately would decrease substantially and in the foreseeable future a greater increase in real property assessments would not be realized. These changes would occur only in those areas where an excess of a 72 foot height limit can now be constructed under existing zoning law.

Had the proposed initiative measure and immediate resultant decrease in assessed valuation been effective on the lien-date in 1971, it is my opinion that the 1971-1972 combined tax rate for the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco School Districts and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District would have been increased by approximately 48 cents per $100.00 assessed valuation.

Should the proposed initiative measure be adopted, it is my opinion that the effect thereof on probable increases in assessed valuation within the next 10 years would result in annual additional combined tax rate increases which would accumulate in the 10th year to approximately $1.44 per $100.00 assessed valuation.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
IF

WOULDN'T IT BE GREAT

... EVERYONE MADE THEIR CHOICE AT HOME ...
... AND BROUGHT THEIR SELECTION CARD ...
... AND VOTED EASILY AND QUICKLY ...

THE RECORDER PRINTING AND PUBLISHING COMPANY
VOTE EARLY
Polls Open From 7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting Machine Will Record Votes ONLY Where The Pointers Are Left DOWN, Covering Names of Candidates.

PROPOSITION A
PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $56,180,000 for the improvement of the public schools in the City and County of San Francisco, including additions to and reconstruction, replacement, alteration and improvement of existing school buildings and educational facilities.

PROPOSITION B
HARBOR IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $34,000,000 for the improvement of the Harbor of the City and County of San Francisco and its facilities.

PROPOSITION C
HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $3,850,000 for additions to and alteration and reconstruction of a portion of the Hall of Justice Building to provide additional courtrooms and related rooms for the Superior and Municipal Courts.

PROPOSITION D
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded indebtedness of $8,491,000 for additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco.

PROPOSITION E
Amends Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5 and 146, relating to organization and administration of Police Department and promotional examinations therein.

MAYOR
VOTE FOR ONE

1-A
JOSEPH L. ALIOTO
Mayor of San Francisco

2-A
JOHN GARBER
Brent Actor

3-A
JEFFREY R. CHASKIN

4-A
STANLEY LEE COTTON
Carpenter

5-A
JOHN G. DIAMANTE
Citizen

6-A
HAROLD DOBIS
Lawyer

7-A
DIANNA FEINSTEIN
President, Board of Supervisors

8-A
SCOTT NEWHALL
Publisher

9-A
FRED SELINGER
Investigator

10-A
J. TONY SERRA
Lawyer

11-A
NATHAN WEINSTEIN
Socialist Worker

12-A
JEFFREY A. BERCHENSKO
Socialist Worker

12-B
YVONNE RENEE WESTBROOK
Student

DOCUMENTS
OCT 7 1971

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY
**DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING**

1st. **MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER** of **VOTING MACHINE** to the **RIGHT** as far as it will go and **LEAVE IT THERE**.

2nd. **TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES** of your choice pull down the **POINTERS** over the names of the **CANDIDATES** for whom you wish to **VOTE** and **LEAVE THEM DOWN**.

---

**POSITION F**

12.1: Empowers supervisors to appoint a budget analyst to supervise duties associated with the fiscal activities of the city.

**PROPOSITION G**

Amends Section 156.2: Permits disability transfer in promotional examinations after five years service in such position.

**PROPOSITION H**

Amends Section 183: Permits Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof, to submit, without cost, arguments opposing any measure submitted to electors by Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof.

**PROPOSITION I**

Amends Section 135: Provides that persons appointed to certain administrative positions in the school department after July 1, 1971, shall be granted four year contracts in said positions.

**PROPOSITION J**

Adds Sections 35.5.1/2 and 36.3.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to establish basic work week for Police Department and to provide for working benefits, premium pay differentials and educational incentive programs for members of Police and Fire Departments.

**PROPOSITION K**

Amends Sections 176, 182 and 183, relating to time of elections, sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.

---

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
MILTON T. Chee | LAURA Dertz | DONALD Donaldson | JEFFREY J. Drapel | MICHAEL Driscoll | ALVIN Duskin | PETER M. Finnegan | TERRY A. Francois | ROBERT E. Gonzalez | NOAH Griffin | QUENTIN L. Kopp | MARJORIE G. Lemlow | DON Masalta
Social Worker | Social Worker | Businessman | Worker | Incumbent | Businessman | Legislative Assistant | Incumbent | Incumbent | Lawyer | Attorney at Law | Businesswoman | Tax Consultant

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
MICHAEL Wong | MORRIS Maxwell Woods, Jr. | Chairman | Electrical Engineer | President | Vice President | Treasurer | Secretary | Director | Manager | Accountant | Consultant | Receptionist
Student | Cable Car Conductor | Senior Electrical Engineer | General Manager | Vice President | Assistant Secretary | Office Assistant | Office Assistant | Office Assistant | Office Assistant | Office Assistant | Office Assistant | Office Assistant

---
TO VOTE FOR or AGAINST PROPOSITIONS or FOR or AGAINST CONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, PULL DOWN pointers over words indicating your choice and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

5th. LEAVE THE POINTERS DOWN and move the RED HANDLE of the VOTING ATTEMPTION.
**SAMPLE BALLOT**
**GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION**
**NOVEMBER 2, 1971**

**CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION R</strong></td>
<td><em>the proposed recodification for the City and County of San Francisco be adopted?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION S</strong></td>
<td>Amends Sections 5, 49 and 134; Provides for Election at Large of Members of Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION T</strong></td>
<td>Initiative Ordinance: Repeals Sections 275, 276, 280-287 inclusive; 290-296.4 inclusive; adds Section 275; re-enacts Sections 250-264 inclusive, Part II, Chapter II, San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code), relating to building heights within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT ATTORNEY</strong></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHERIFF</strong></td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-A</td>
<td>44-A</td>
<td>45-A</td>
<td>46-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILLIAM C. Bigarani</strong> Inspector of Police, (Sergeant)</td>
<td><strong>MATTHEW C. Carberry</strong> Sheriff of San Francisco</td>
<td><strong>RICHARD HONTZ</strong> Criminologist</td>
<td><strong>MATTHEW O'CONNOR</strong> Law Enforcement Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Y. Chinn</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr. Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VOTE EARLY**
Polls Open From 7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting Machine Will Record Votes ONLY Where The Pointers Are Left DOWN, Covering Names of Candidates.

---

**PROPOSITION A**
**PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING BONDS, 1971.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $56,180,000 for the improvement of the public schools in the City and County of San Francisco, including additions to and reconstruction, replacement, alteration and improvement of existing school buildings and educational facilities.

---

**PROPOSITION B**
**HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $34,000,000 for the improvement of the Harbor of the City and County of San Francisco and its facilities.

---

**PROPOSITION C**
**HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $5,850,000 for additions to and alteration and reconstruction of a portion of the Hall of Justice Building to provide additional courtrooms and related rooms for the Superior and Municipal Courts.

---

**PROPOSITION D**
**FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971.** To incur a bonded indebtedness of $6,491,000 for additions to and improvement of the fire protection systems in the City and County of San Francisco.

---

**PROPOSITION E**
Amends Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4, 35.5, 35.51 and 146, relating to organization and administration of Police Department and promotional examinations therein.

---

**MAYOR**
VOTE FOR ONE

1-A STANLEY LEE Cotton Carpenter
2-A JOHN C. Diamante Citizen
3-A HAROLD Dobbs Lawyer Businessman
4-A DIANNE Feinstein President Board of Supervisors
5-A SCOTT Newhall Publisher Business Executive
6-A FRED Selinger Investment Executive Environmentalist
7-A J. TONY Serra Lawyer
8-A NATHAN Weinstein Socialist Worker
9-A JOSEPH L. Alioto Mayor of San Francisco
10-A JOHN Gardner Brent Actor
11-A JEFFREY R. Chaskin
12-A ROBERT E. Gonzales Incumbent
12-B ALVIN Duskin Businessman

---
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**OCT 7 1971**

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING

1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

3rd. CARD on C not p. intend

POSITION

F 12.1: Empowers visors to appoint budget analyst to the duties

YES PROPOSITION
G Amends Section 156.2: Permits disability transferee to participate in promotional examinations after five years service in such position.

NO PROPOSITION
H Amends Section 183: Permits Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof, to submit, without cost, arguments oppose any measure submitted to electors by Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof.

YES PROPOSITION
I Amends Section 135: Provides that persons appointed to certain administrative positions in school department after July 1, 1971, shall be granted four year contracts in said positions.

NO PROPOSITION
J Adds Sections 35.5.1 and 36.3.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to establish basic work week for Police Department and to provide for working benefits, premium pay differentials and educational incentive programs for members of Police and Fire Departments.

YES PROPOSITION
K Amends Sections 176, 182 and 183, relating to time of elections, sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.

Adds S a separate San Fr. leg. F' election

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

SU

13-A NOAH Griffin Lawyer
14-A QUENTIN L. Kopp Attorney at Law
15-A MARJORIE G. Lemlow Businesswoman Housewife
16-A DON Masalta Tax Consultant
17-A RICHARD MARSHALL McGhee Teamster
18-A ROBERT H. MENDELSON Incumbent
19-A JOSEPH N. Minahan Labor-Management Consultant
20-A JOHN L. Molinari Businessman
21-A ROBERT G. Nelson Businessman-Consulted Parent
22-A RONALD Pelosi Incumbent
23-A REV. EDWARD Preston Minister
24-A MARY HELEN Rogers Community Worker
25-A JAMES J. Rourke Labor Representative

13-B PETER M. Finnegon Legislative Assistant
14-B TERRY A. Francois Incumbent
TO VOTE FOR or AGAINST PROPOSITIONS or FOR or AGAINST CONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, PULL DOWN pointers over words indicating your choice and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

5th. LEAVE THE POINTERS DOWN and move the RED HANDLE of the VOTING...
**Sample Ballot**

**General Municipal Election**

**November 2, 1971**

---

**City and County Propositions**

Vote Yes or No on Each

---

### Proposition R
Amends Sections 5, 49 and 134:
Provides for Election at Large of Members of Board of Education.

### Proposition S
Initiative Ordinance: Repeals Sections 275, 276, 280-287 inclusive, 290-296.4 inclusive; adds Section 275; re-enacts Sections 250-264 inclusive, Part II, Chapter II, San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code), relating to building heights within the City and County of San Francisco.

---

**District Attorney**

Vote for One

- [ ] 39
- [ ] 40
- [ ] 41
- [ ] 42
- [ ] 43
- [ ] 44
- [ ] 45
- [ ] 46
- 47
- 48

**Sheriff**

Vote for One

- [ ] 43-A
- [ ] 44-A
- [ ] 45-A
- 46-A

**Member of the Board of Education**

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

- [ ] 47-A
- [ ] 48-A
- 49-A
- 50-A

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>JOE ALDSON WAYNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>JEFFREY J. DRAPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>MICHAEL J. DRISCOLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>JOHN JAY FERDON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-A</td>
<td>MATTHEW C. CARBERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-A</td>
<td>RICHARD DUANE HONGISTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-A</td>
<td>MATTHEW &quot;MATT&quot; O'CONNOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-A</td>
<td>WILLIAM C. BIGARANI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-A</td>
<td>George Y. Chinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-A</td>
<td>Dr. Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOTE EARLY
Polls Open From
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting Machine Will Record Votes
ONLY Where The Pointers Are Left
DOWN, Covering Names of Candidates.

PROPOSITION A
PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING
BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded
indebtedness of $36,180,000 for
the improvement of the public
schools in the City and County of
San Francisco, including additions
to and reconstruction, replacement,
alteration and improvement of existing school buildings and
educational facilities.

PROPOSITION B
HARBOR IMPROVEMENT
BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded
indebtedness of $34,000,000 for
the improvement of the Harbor
of the City and County of San
Francisco and its facilities.

PROPOSITION C
HALL OF JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT
BONDS, 1971. To incur a bonded
indebtedness of $3,850,000 for additions to and
alteration and reconstruction of
a portion of the Hall of Justice
Building to provide additional
courtrooms and related rooms
for the Superior and Municipal
Courts.

PROPOSITION D
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS
IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971.
To incur a bonded indebtedness of
$8,491,000 for additions to
and improvement of the fire
protection systems in the City and
County of San Francisco.

PROPOSITION E
Amends Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4,
35.5, 35.5½ and 146, relating to
organization and administration of
Police Department and promontional examinations therein.

MAYOR
VOTE FOR ONE

1-A
DIANNE
Feinstein
President, Board of
Supervisors

2-A
SCOTT
Newhall
Publisher, Business
Executive

3-A
FRED
Selinger
Investment Executive,
Environmentalist

4-A
J. TONY
Serra
Lawyer

5-A
NATHAN
Weinstein
Socialist Worker

6-A
JOSEPH L.
Alioto
Mayor of San Francisco

7-A
JOHN
Gardner
Brent
Actor

8-A
JEFFREY R.
Chaskin

9-A
STANLEY
Lee
Carpenter

10-A
JOHN C.
Diamante
Citizen

11-A
HAROLD
Dobbs
Lawyer, Businessman

12-A
ROBERT G.
Nelson
Businessman

12-B
ROBERT H.
Mendelssohn
Incumbent

DOUGMENTS

OCT 7 1971

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY
DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING

1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

POSITION

12.1: Empowers revisors to appoint budget analyst to the duties of revisors.
Amends Section 156.2: Permits disability transferee to participate in promotional examinations after five years service in such position.
Amends Section 183: Permits Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof, to submit, without cost, arguments opposing any measure submitted to electors by Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof.
Amends Section 135: Provides that personnel appointed to certain administrative positions in school department after July 1, 1971, shall be granted four-year contracts in said positions.
Adds Sections 35.5.1/4 and 36.3.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to establish basic work week for Police Department and to provide for working benefits, premium pay differentials and educational incentive programs for members of Police and Fire Departments.
Amends Sections 176, 182 and 183, relating to time of elections, sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.
Adds Section 176, 182 and 183, relating to time of elections, sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.

13-A
RONALD Pelosi Incumbent

14-A REV. EDWARD Preston Minister

15-A MARY HELEN Rogers Community Worker

16-A JAMES J. Rourke Labor Representative

17-A THOMAS N. Ryan Librarian-Page

18-A MARK R. Schneider Socialist

19-A BONNIE SUB Sheppard Socialist Worker

20-A JANE Sica Socialist

21-A STEPHEN ROGER Tietjen Personnel Executive

22-A GERRY Torres Civil Engineer

23-A SAMUEL Unger Management-Tax Services

24-A YVONNE RENEE Westbrook Student

25-A MICHAEL Wong Student

13-B
JOSEPH N. Minahan Labor-Management Consultant

14-B JOHN L. Molinari Businessman
1. Ballot label: Raise numbered slide at top of machine corresponding to number of office

2. Title card: Write name of candidate on paper under slide. (Do not raise pointer over name of any candidate in office group in which you wish to write in name of a candidate.)

3. 4th. To vote for or against propositions or for or against confirmation of members of board of education, pull down pointers over words indicating your choice and leave them down.

4. 5th. Leave the pointers down and move the red handle of the voting lever to the right.

Propositions:

L: Section 136.1: Establishes a governing board for Cisco Community College and provides for members thereof.

M: Repeals Section 117.1 and adds Section 117.2: Prescribes procedure for amendments to zoning ordinances, reclassifications of property or establishment, abolition or modification of setback lines.

N: Amends Section 165.2 and adds Sections 161.4 and 165.2.2, relating to retirement benefits of miscellaneous employees; provides for military service credit and recalculation of certain retirement allowances.

O: Amends Sections 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, 23, 72, 141, 147.1, 151 and 224, and adds Section 10.1, relating to publication, printing and notices relating to legislation and legislative meetings.

P: Amends Section 171.1.5: Provides for retirement allowance to widow upon death of fireman from non-industrial causes after ten years of service.

Q: Amends Section 119.3: Provides for minimum schedules and maximum fares on cable car lines.

- E R V I S O R S

Vote for six:

26-A: Morris Arwell, A. Conductor
27-A: Jeffrey A. Berchenko
28-A: Milton T. Chee
29-A: Laura Dertz
30-A: Donald Drapel
31-A: Jeffrey J. Drapel
32-A: Michael Joseph Driscoll
33-A: Alvin Duskin
34-A: Peter M. Finnegan
35-A: Terry A. Francois
36-A: Robert E. Gonzales
37-A: Noah Griffin
38-A: Quentin L. Koppen

...
**SAMPLE BALLOT**

**GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION**

**NOVEMBER 2, 1971**

### CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**VOTE YES OR NO ON EACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION R</strong>&lt;br&gt;Amends Sections 5, 49 and 134; Provides for Election at Large of Members of Board of Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION S</strong>&lt;br&gt;Initiative Ordinance: Repeals Sections 275, 276, 280-287 inclusive, 290-296 inclusive; adds Section 275; re-enacts Sections 250-264 inclusive, Part II, Chapter II, San Francisco Municipal Code (City Planning Code), relating to building heights within the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION T</strong>&lt;br&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>District Attorney</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Sheriff</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Member of the Board of Education</th>
<th>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</th>
<th>Member of the Board of Education</th>
<th>Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42-A</td>
<td>JOHN JAY Ferdon</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>43-A</td>
<td>RICHARD Duane Hongisto</td>
<td>Criminologist</td>
<td>44-A</td>
<td>MATTHEW Matthew O'Connor</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-A</td>
<td>DON Masaita</td>
<td>Tax Consultant</td>
<td>42-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-A</td>
<td>RICHARD Marshall McGhee</td>
<td>Teamster</td>
<td>43-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **George Y. Chinn**
- **Dr. Eugene S. Hopp, M.D.**
VOTE EARLY
Polls Open From
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting Machine Will Record Votes
ONLY Where The Pointers Are Left
DOWN, Covering Names of Candidates.

YES
PROPOSITION
PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDING
BONDS, 1971. To incur a bond-
ed indebtedness of $56,180,000 for
the improvement of the public
schools in the City and County of
San Francisco, including additions
to and reconstruction, replace-
ment, alteration and improve-
ment of existing school buildings
and educational facilities.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
HARBOR IMPROVEMENT
BONDS, 1971. To incur a bond-
ed indebtedness of $94,000,000 for
the improvement of the Har-
bor of the City and County of
San Francisco and its facilities.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
HALF OF JUSTICE IMPROVE-
MENT BONDS, 1971. To incur a bond-
ed indebtedness of $35,000,000 for
alteration and reconstruction of
a portion of the Hall of Justice
Building to provide additional
courtrooms and related rooms
for the Superior and Municipal
Courts.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS
IMPROVEMENT BONDS, 1971.
To incur a bonded indebtedness
of $8,491,000 for additions to
and improvement of the fire pro-
tection systems in the City and
County of San Francisco.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
Amends Sections 35, 35.3, 35.4,
35.5, 35.5½ and 146, relating to
organization and administration of
Police Department and pro-
motional examinations therein.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
Adds Section Board of Supe
and remove
and to presc
thereof.

MAYOR
VOTE FOR ONE

1-A
J. TONY
Serra
Lawyer

2-A
NATHAN
Weinstein
Socialist
Worker

3-A
JOSEPH L.
Alioto
Mayor of
San Francisco

4-A
JOHN
GARDNER
Brent
Actor

5-A
JEFFREY R.
Chaskin

6-A
STANLEY
LEE
Cotton
Carpenter

7-A
JOHN C.
Diamante
Citizen

8-A
HAROLD
Dobbs
Lawyer-
Businessman

9-A
DIANN
Feinstein
President,
Board of
Supervisors

10-A
SCOTT
Newhall
Publisher-
Business
Executive

11-A
FRED
Selinger
Investment
Executive-
Environmentalist

12-A
STEPHEN
ROGER
Tietjen
Personnel
Executive

12-B
MARK R.
Schneider
Socialist

DOCUMENTS
OCT 7 1971
SAN FRANCISCO
**DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING**

1st. **MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER** of **VOTING MACHINE** to the **RIGHT** as far as it will go and **LEAVE IT THERE.**

2nd. **TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES** of your choice pull down the **POINTERS** over the names of the **CANDIDATES** for whom you wish to **VOTE** and **LEAVE THEM DOWN.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITION**

12.1: Empowers budget analysts to appoint persons to serve in the duties of such position.

12.2: Amends Section 156.2: Permits disability transferees to participate in promotional examinations after five years service in such position.

12.3: Amends Section 163: Permits Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof, to submit, without cost, arguments opposing any measure submitted to electors by Mayor, Board of Supervisors or four or more members thereof.

12.4: Amends Section 135: Provides that persons appointed to certain administrative positions in school department after July 1, 1971, shall be granted four year contracts in said positions.

12.5: Adds Sections 35.5.1 and 36.3.1: Empowers Board of Supervisors to establish basic week for Police Department and to provide for working benefits, premium pay differentials and educational incentive programs for members of Police and Fire Departments.

12.6: Amends Sections 176, 182 and 183, relating to time of election, sample ballots and other material to be mailed to voters.

**S U**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Management-Tax Services</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Cable Car Conductor</td>
<td>Socialist Worker</td>
<td>Socialist Worker</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Legislative Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S U**

| 15-B BONNIE SUE SHEPPARD | 14-B JANE SICA |
| Socialist Worker | Socialist |
TO VOTE FOR or AGAINST PROPOSITIONS or FOR or AGAINST CONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, PULL DOWN pointers over words indicating your choice and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

5th. LEAVE THE POINTERS DOWN and move the RED HANDLE of the VOTING

OPPOSITION

Yes: Proposition L
Repeals Section 117.1 and adds Section 117.1: Prescribes procedure for amendments to zoning ordinances, reclassifications of property or establishment, abolition or modification of setback lines.

Yes: Proposition M
Amends Section 165.2 and adds Sections 161.4 and 165.2.2, relating to retirement benefits of miscellaneous employees; provides for military service credit and recalculation of certain retirement allowances.

Yes: Proposition N
Amends Sections 10, 15, 17, 19, 23, 72, 141, 147.1, 151 and 224, and adds Section 10.1, relating to publication, printing and notices; relating to legislation and legislative meetings.

Yes: Proposition O
Amends Section 171.1.5; Provides for retirement allowance to widow upon death of fireman from non-industrial causes after ten years of service.

Yes: Proposition P
Amends Section 119.3; Provides for minimum schedules and maximum fares on cable car lines.

VOTE FOR SIX

26-A
EUGENE A. FRANCOIS
Incumbent

27-A
ROGER E. GONZALES
Incumbent

28-A
NOAH GRAF
Lawyer

29-A
QUINN S. KOPP
Attorney at Law

30-A
MARGARET G. LEMLEW
Businesswoman

31-A
DONALD MASTALA
Tax Consultant

32-A
RICHARD MARSHALL
McGhee
Teamster

33-A
ROBERT H. MENDELSON
Incumbent

34-A
JOSEPH N. MINAHAN
Labor Management
Consultant

35-A
JOHN L. MOLINARI
Businessman

36-A
ROBERT G. NELSON
Businessman

37-A
RONALD PELOSI
Incumbent

38-A
REV. EDWARD PRESTON
Minister