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### Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAN P. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Comerciante</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney General of California/Fiscal General de California</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH MARTINEZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcaldes-Los Angeles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Professional Trucker/Camionero</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent</td>
<td>Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MC CATHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Asambleyman, California Legislature/Assembleista, de la Legislatura de California</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian</td>
<td>Restaurant Consultant/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Político</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL HALLETT, Republican</td>
<td>State Legislator/Farmer//Legislador Estatal/Granjero</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON DUFFY, Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisador del Estado de California</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaría de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Controller**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE MCDONALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY, Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY GINGELL, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM, American Independent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treasurer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrero de Obra</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Analyst/Analista</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attorney General**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democrat</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condados de Los Angeles</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member, State Board of Equalization—1st District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Board of Equalization, Assistant Member, First District/Departamento de Hacienda, Miembro asistente, el distrito</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NYGREN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. &quot;BILL&quot; IVERS, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisrador del Estado de California</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United States Senator

THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent
Print/Impresor

DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom
Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro

PETE WILSON, Republican
Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian
Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic
Governor of California/Gobernador de California

Representative in Congress—5th District

MILTON MARKS, Republican
State Senator 5th District/Senator Estatal, Distrito No. 5

PHILIP BURTON, Democratic
Member of the United States Congress/Miembro del Congreso Estadounidense

JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian
Newspaper Editor/Editor (Redactor) de Periódico

Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District

ART AGNOS, Democratic
State Assemblyman/Asambleísta Estatal

GORDON A. BLOYER, Republican
Management Consultant/Consultor de Gerente
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Question in Spanish</th>
<th>Question in English</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Voter Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANK K. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall FRANK K. RICHARDSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTO M. KAUS</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall OTTO M. KAUS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN E. BROUSSARD</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall ALLEN E. BROUSSARD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ REYNOSO</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall JOHN T. RACANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall JOHN J. MILLER be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall JEROME A. SMITH be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>Ser elegido al puesto para el tiempo que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>Shall CLINTON WAYNE WHITE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1**

**Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1**

- **Patricia (Pat) Lucey**  
  Attorney/Abogada

- **Alfred G. Chiancelli**  
  Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal

**Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8**

**Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8**

- **Robert Silvestri**  
  Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte

- **Robert Barnes**  
  Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes

- **Eugene Garfinkle**  
  BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART

- **Bob Geary**  
  Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Jefe Contra Impuestos de Alcantarillado

**NOTE**

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
### Superintendent of Public Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Suplantante Estatal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONIG</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Suplantante de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA M. WILSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>President San Francisco Board of Education/President, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE L. O'BRIEN</td>
<td>Free Schooler - Economics Instructor/Escolar Libre - Instructor de Economía</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET CRICHTON DE OSUNA</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Candidate Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL ROSSELLI</td>
<td>Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORAND</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL S. BERNICK</td>
<td>Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT A. D'APRADO</td>
<td>Physician, Educador/Médico, Educador</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND MOGLEN</td>
<td>Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Administrator/Fiscal Planner/ Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>社會主義聯盟鬥士</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>公共服務律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUERI</td>
<td>獨立商人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>旅館待者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>米慎街基督教男青年會主任</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator, Misión YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>稅務顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>舊金山教育委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>房屋問題活動份子</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>商人／聖經傳道者</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher//Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>犯罪學學生</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>社會主義聯盟鬥士</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>上天女修士</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>社區活躍人士，新聞從業員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. D'YOUNG</td>
<td>文字處理員／作家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Processor/Writer//Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>音樂家、作曲家</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician, Composer/Musicista</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>校區顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>教育委員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. &quot;BELLE STARR&quot; MOSELEY</td>
<td>藝術家、律師、活動分子</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>實業評值員，顧問</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultor</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Acquisitions Bond Act. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $85,000,000.</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>First-Time Home Buyers Bond Act of 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Pension Fund Investment. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.</td>
<td>YES 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núm.</td>
<td>Voto</td>
<td>Proposición</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A Favor</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Favor</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Favor</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A Favor</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A Favor</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from “newly constructed” definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 211 ➞
NO 212 ➞

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing “taxes” to anticipated “revenues”. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

YES 215 ➞
NO 216 ➞

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

YES 220 ➞
NO 221 ➞

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

YES 225 ➞
NO 226 ➞

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 229 ➞
NO 230 ➞

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 233 ➞
NO 234 ➞
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

TASACION, VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura excluir la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por remoción automática o sistemas de alarma de la definición de “reconstruido”. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instale el sistema, se puede aumentar los costos de impuestos. Un aumento desconocido en los costos locales para contrarrestar el aumento de costos. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Seguro: Un préstamo leve costearía el interés de los nuevos o similares a los actuales. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Seguro: Un préstamo leve costearía el interés de los nuevos o similares a los actuales. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.


TEXTOS ESCOLARES. ESCUELAS NO PUBLICAS. Autoriza la provisión de textos en una bae de préstamo tipo biblioteca a estudiantes de escuelas no públicas bajo condiciones prescritas. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Al instrumentarse, costos aumentados de salario y jubilación para el estado y/o los condados para los juegos elevados, y costos administrativos desconocidos a ahorros, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo a un voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Al instrumentarse, costos aumentados de salario y jubilación para el estado y/o los condados para los juegos elevados, y costos administrativos desconocidos a ahorros, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de reembolso de cincuenta centavos o más que debe ser pagado al devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y desecho de desperdicios sólidos y un aumento o disminución de cantidad desconocida en colecciones de recaudaciones de impuestos. Vea el cálculo del Analista para explicación de las variables.

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador le escriba al Presidente para urgirle que le proponga a la Unión Soviética un alto en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst’s estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237
NO 238

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature’s power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumption of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241
NO 242

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst’s estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245
NO 246

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249
NO 250

B Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 3/4 of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252
NO 253

C Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256
NO 257

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

YES 259
NO 260
RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permita asignaciones para aguas fuertes, uso del Río Stanislaus y regulamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de aguas (fríoles). Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1.48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hídricos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de litigación; pérdida desconocida de ríos de centrales eléctricas y corriente desconocida de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

COMISION DE NUEVO PRÓRROGA. Aboga por la reelección de los legisladores sobre el nuevo prorrateo y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo prorrateo de distintos legislativos y de justicia, lo que permitirá contar con los electores de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en pronósticos del Analista, habría un aumento de costos de $126,000 en 1983 y una cuantía comparable cada 10 años de 1983.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO


246 NO - ARMAS DE FUEGO

249 SI - ¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quesa de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quesas de ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción en el caso?

250 NO - ¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quesa de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quesas de ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción en el caso?

252 SI - ¿Debería la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Revenue, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, excepto de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deberán exceder 5% de 1 centro de cada $100 de ronda de propiedad fiscal y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

253 NO - ¿Debería la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Revenue, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, excepto de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deberán exceder 5% de 1 centro de cada $100 de ronda de propiedad fiscal y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

256 SI - ¿Debería autorizar a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagar a parte particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolso por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

257 NO - ¿Debería autorizar a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagar a parte particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolso por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

259 SI - ¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los cónyuges sobrevivientes de los veteranos que estén activos o jubilados? ¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

260 NO - ¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los cónyuges sobrevivientes de los veteranos que estén activos o jubilados? ¿Debería la ciudad subvencionar a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td><strong>YES 261</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td><strong>YES 267</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td><strong>YES 270</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td><strong>YES 273</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td><strong>YES 276</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td><strong>YES 279</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td><strong>YES 282</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td><strong>YES 285</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núm.</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

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

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

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

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3).

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

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
- mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters' handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in." If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

**BONDS OR NOTES** — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

**BUDGET** — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

**CAPITAL COSTS** — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

**MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES** — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**POLLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

---

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney

My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olcomedy, Albert Woolenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kaye, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing; Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lucey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian
My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration, the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42
My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator
My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:
— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate his commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committee man Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:
— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: "The people don't care."
— "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police "decoy" operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who's Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflamable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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SISTER BOOM BOOM
My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

RICHARD BRADLEY
My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32


Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:
Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1833 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christiann H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-50th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 723-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welch, 5-27th St., Painter
Brian James Wilson, 3231-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Bunion, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dobson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotsohode Kikl, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tocherer, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobletz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Beelie Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waler St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 32-11th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Sunley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukseich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoriada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 891 Haight, Minister
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36

Diana Coleman

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist
My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality... safer neighborhoods... stronger rent control... affordable housing... control downtown growth... employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nutan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-17th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Crumer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gills, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Romi Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Clevle Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 19 Deleh St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoio, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Strescher, 1000 Shadr St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wulfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

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

JERRY R. De YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Deliseo Graham, 2407 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Hadent, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilaclon, 88 Waterville St., Distribution Att'd Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst./Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Samborsky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Summer St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing.
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Francisco.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond J. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Buscher, 337-40th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coonradt, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Ross Cnibre, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
E. P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAttee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lupio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samaras, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Josh E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny F. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martín Eng can win!

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:
Ted Aksnes, 1882 Green St., Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Belli, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Peterslie, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 L 【y】 , Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University Instructor
Michael Strausz, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Roobin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER

My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common-sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paullette Belliveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jared L. Burtine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irina Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliott, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1300 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 758 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitts, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
- Policeman for 10 years,
- Sheriff, elected twice,
- Commissioner of prison system,
- Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55

My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St, Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St, Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St, Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St, Housewife
Pinskey Andrews, 286 Guerrero St, Health Administration
Carmemita L. Deda Cruz, 2783 Bryant St, Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St, Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St, Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St, Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St, Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dow, 385 Nevada St, Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave, Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St, Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St, Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave, Immigration Coordinator
Deter
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave, Wife
Barry Win, Showers, 977 Shotwell St, Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St, Law Clerk
Bashelle Cottonreader, 215 St Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St, Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave, Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St, Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St, Landlord

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

ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Cautrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergees, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Berntsen, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakos, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arbello
My occupation is Urban Planner
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn’t do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $136 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahones, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randell, Cab Driver
John Beauley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1400 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3068 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Gramet, 1257-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 4118-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Welsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER
My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California’s major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Betty Ann McMahon
My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco’s future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Curriwan, 2530 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Findax, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forslund, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Honn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melaniehy, 125 Juana Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3382 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocka, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocka, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapito, 66 Soledad Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scallon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Robert Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2764 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shadrac St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yale, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.  

Eric Moncur

K. F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city’s problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.
I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley “Belle Starr”

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Amerie Azevedo, 269 Cherry St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Mebane F. Crook, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Dana, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Dudum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Lockley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 88 Clary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Mgr.
Alanna Hartzok, 269 Cherry, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Himabayashi, 5377 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahoutke, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Swier, 320 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Sirofumi, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1392 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipton St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burke, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loreti L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Cline Forrest, 40 Langston St., Accountant
Paula “Rain” Laguna, 2267-20th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Liveris, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Soolarits, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen's Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:
- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable,
- Creating needed services for seniors,
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing,
- Assuring healthful drinking water,
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

 Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
 George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
 Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
 Stanley M. Smith, 411 Fulton, Labor Union Official
 Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
 Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
 Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
 Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
 John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
 Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
 Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
 John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
 Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
 Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
 Mark Forrester, 55 Elise St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
 Thelma Kavanagh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
 Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
 Leonard "Lefty" Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
 Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
 Shirley Cohan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization
 Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
 Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Srn.
 Escort Service
 William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
 Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
 Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
 Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
 Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
 Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
 Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
 Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It's time for a change!

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:

 Alfred D. Bacei, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
 Angela J. Bocchetti, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
 Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
 Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
 Margaret C. DeOsinna, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
 George Dickenson, 721 Cayuga St., Retired
 Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
 Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
 Kathleen A. Galbengan, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
 Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
 Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
 Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
 Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
 R.E. Kennedy, 55 Monte Carlo Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
 Margaret Koehne, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
 Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
 Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
 Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
 Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
 Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
 Claire Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
 Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
 Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
 Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
 Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OLGA TALAMANTE

My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:

Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Goselin, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudiburg, 2727 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franconia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purcell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabish, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emiet Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldamando, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shadrac, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 225 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

WILLIAM TOCCO

My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:

Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR
Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John D. Doyle, 2988-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elise, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68½ Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johnson, 2238-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latino, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffer’s Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38
John Vibe, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zumaima, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city’s communities, leaders and constituents.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaicks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrupino R. Ceballos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President LL.W.U.
Ruth S. Kudish, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Deli, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 656-40th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruchera, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 406 Stanyan St., Commissioner
Joseph Frietas, Jr., 3360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Hong, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachtman, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Horvitz, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomatna N. Scott, 19122 Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirius, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42


San Francisco needs a new voice.

I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.

Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Mortimer Fleischacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susán Garelli, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guererro St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconi, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc., Executive
Peter J. Nordoza, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsey B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neipart, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Hern, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.  

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblmeny
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr, 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof, Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamore, 3222 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Dolmar St., Airport Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Tampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casis Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Boca, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanic, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA
My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3747B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arbello Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taqi-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkurth, 77 Gladstones Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia A. Moorer, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburg St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Teresa Faulkner, 327-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3747B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon P. Navaarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3747B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Petit, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 318-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:
New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal.
Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Ross Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1055 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerchow, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2630-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Baroco, 57 Paradise Ave., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dung, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Supt.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pallis, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Scolari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stucke, 318 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tessman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zisko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Eapeland, 1578-27th Ave., Sla. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agritino Cebato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Cohlentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carloita Textor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denbein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Gosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1400 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Mugellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molnar, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mor, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemeroski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burl Tolter, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yuri Wada, 555-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn’t!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 3½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Philipp Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shredar, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gild, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agricola R. Corbotos, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lacrado Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Saudman, 756-270th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:

Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgari, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes F. Chan, 1 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avala St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Wallie G. Jibe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiaivo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terbeyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Aleso Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Wisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

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

ROBERT E. BURTON
My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1279 Shadrack Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women’s Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehal Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 535 Port Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community College
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President ILWU
Alleen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Agar Juicaks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrerro Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouyy, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thecla Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Assistant Director
Ario Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Montecello, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO
My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

Robert A. Da Prato

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O’Brien, 1306-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondi, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Pennie L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Golin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CAROLE MIGDEN

My address is 561 - 28th Street

My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator

My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding. The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:

— to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
— to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
— to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borivo, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Branno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agrinino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Dennebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Elsasser, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Agar Jacobs, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Arnstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margal Kaufman, 3010-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 631 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomata N. Scott, 191½ Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Haie Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLLEN,
M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24

My occupation is Public Health Administrator

My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:

George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tsao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. DeLeoncenco, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serena Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zechar Madachian, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kielwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helge G. Kairys, 768-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjil, 314 Kearny, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marlyn Sperber, 2665 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevors, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gumon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. DeLeoncenco, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizaboth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

SAL ROSSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence - not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Dennehy, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessy, 1400 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boncheto, 11 Clavey Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 410 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Wailer St., Analyst
Will Leon, 1407-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3251-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vykisch, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1259 Shadrer, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bd.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary J. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preson Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Reaators
Robert DeVries, 351-B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Hermin Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Robert Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 633 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airport Commissioners
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fothingore Gill, 2901 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Leo Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. Public

Clintom Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margarette Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tant, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1290 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA

My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shafter, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 830 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehali Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager

Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennestad, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 280 - 47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heath Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shinnmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillirius St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER: City Hall.

Work at the polls on election day. Apply now in Room 155.

快! 有什麼好方法是樂趣的，幫助鄰居，同時可以增加收入？

答案：服務選民。

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

otra misión

Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.

Las elecciones, ofreciendo una solución en la

Tábale en los lugares de votación el día de
SFPD Citizen Complaint Office

PROPOSITION A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens’ complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators’ salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens’ complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That’s just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.’s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.’s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department’s disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer’s authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reject Moscone-Milk “killer-cop” Dan White: YES on “A” ... Defeat BART Board’s Eugene Garfinkle (whom Dan White ballot-sponsored in 1978).

— MOSCONIE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCONIE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don’t demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

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

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda "Committee for Economic Democracy" proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of "fat" APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the "POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT" are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it's efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can "dream up" more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960's that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspend- ed and terminated by the Chief or the Police Com- mission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a "cure-all", but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serv- ing.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

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

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City's ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City's ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller's Statement on "B"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on "B"

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

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


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs... Vote Yes on C.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!

Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D APPEARS ON PAGE 89.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
John L. Molinari Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne Board of Supervisors
Richard D. Hongisto Board of Supervisors
Lee Dolson Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward Board of Supervisors
F. Walter Johnson Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

The full legal text of Proposition E appears on page 89.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

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

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one “provider” and one “dependent” in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition “E” are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote “YES” on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse’s life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: “The costs cannot be accurately determined.”

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said “Quote” “The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it’s a new field. We have no actuarial data.”

“We also do not know how many people the plan would affect.”

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:

William T. Reed

PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ($9,600) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:
— This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.
— This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.
— This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.
— This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
Supervisors’ Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it’s the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors’ current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors’ salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco’s taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS’ SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccari
Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermoso
Willis Hannawalt

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

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorsen
Martin A. Feltbauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sozzi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Aloysius J. Smyth
Joan Willemsen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emoyln Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jebe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Groth
Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Bessie Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farberstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibach
Dorothy Nisley
Carolyn Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander
Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Cary
Cheryl Marqule
Francis Naccarato
Ruth Padden
Enola Maxwell
Hal Crusan
Walter G. Jebe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerold Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Leeback
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongnian
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Gunn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Lona Follen
William McGrath

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine L. Ramus
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinet
Ann Foglerberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Caari
Rita Dallimonti
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marion Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fagen
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garbalda
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffit
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini
Supervisors' Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor's salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

- The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

- Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

- People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

- A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

- Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it’s the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on "G"

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let's break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually $ 105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually $ 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at $1786 per month — $21,450 annually $ 259,402

Total $ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON "G"

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote "NO"!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors' pay to 25% of the Mayor's salary): "The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time."

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
(Republican Committeeman)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

PROPOSITION H

Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE

Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide "Fixed" employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on "age at entry" into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on "age at entry" is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a "fixed" rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, "age at entry" rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City's rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years’ cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers’ Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,

(Continued on page 90)
PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

The challenge of effective law enforcement in today's society of high and rising crime rates requires competent men and women from all backgrounds and walks of life. At a cost of approximately .99 cents a month, you can help create one fair system of compensation and at the same time help the San Francisco Police Department become competitive in recruiting the finest people for the job.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Bob Barry
President S.F. Police Officers Association
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore
Gordon Lau
Former Supervisor
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
Chuck Ayala
Director, C.Y.O.
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
John Foran
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circum-

stances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote Yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their activity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It will cost the city a lot more than the new plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election
day, November 2nd.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour’s pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour’s pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District
Chuck Ayala
Director C.Y.O.
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
5th Congressional District

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Assembly
Doris M. Ward
Supervisor
C/C San Francisco

John Foran
State Senator
6th District
Jo Daly
San Francisco Police
Commissioner
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPÍTULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

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

第一章：工作良機

你可以在十一月二日三藩市選舉日工作，特別歡迎雙語人士應聘在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票。請往市政廳（福龍街）一五五室申請。
PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E’s Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you’re right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 “public power” cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn’t pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city’s hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy’s cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go “public power”. And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto (public)</td>
<td>$11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding (public)</td>
<td>$12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (public)</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Baker
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borvice
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lish Carter
Manuel Ceballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Conny Ford
Eulalia Fransto
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zuretti Gooby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood
Council
Vincent Hallman
Sue Hester
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candace Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
David Looman
Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shaskan
Stanley Shields
James Shoch
Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Snead
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Cara O’Byland
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E’s electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(Democratic Committeeman)
Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait ’til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we’d have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we’d be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930’s, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON “K”

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Sliver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER” and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

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

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

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as $15 million).

*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.

*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).

*A huge new City administrative staff.

*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsiell
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. "K"

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)

Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)
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Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote “Yes” on Proposition “L”. Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote “Yes” on “L”.

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION
Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco’s world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The “Can’t use the side door” fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an asymmetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient “off-street” access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intoleraible!

An unbtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on “symbolism” to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, “costs be damned” career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to “butcher” the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn’t enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls . . . A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition “L” denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition “L” would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition “L” is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on “L” for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman: Canon Kim
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Belayot
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Huriado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamante, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor’s Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Naomi Sohn
Westia Whitfield
Lucille Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodeslaw
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McBastie Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolfed, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatre Rhonoceros
Dmitri Belsas
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Phillip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinar
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Ruberg
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

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

OOPS!

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

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

How Prop M Got on Ballot
On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever-increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samarcides, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco’s housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project’s site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O’Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O’Connell
William Sepatatis
David Finn
Sylvia Durance
Lyle Conley
Willfred Willis
June Sanchez
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devron Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco’s tax-payers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

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

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

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco’s housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Soulis
Gene Prat
William Conrey
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL: VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco’s tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote NO on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardin Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Bardin
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote NO on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed "medically oriented" use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other "ancillary commercial areas" in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote "NO" on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote "NO" on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECOMBE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLL NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

San Francisco Civic Associations

SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITON FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrikis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioneers and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Milla Cucek
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennis
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandson
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadia Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill
Ellen Huppert
Peter Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lalanee
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Matthew LaVail
Margaret Norheist
Kenny O'Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salmon
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeeman)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
(Proposition A, Continued)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION B**

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

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimates, and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ((in amount not to) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require: (2) for repairs and maintenance: (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described: (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions: (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

((f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.}) (End)
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7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
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8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)
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8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Any allowance heretofore terminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION H
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the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 percent 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50⅔</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50⅔</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51⅓</td>
<td>1.1200</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>52½</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52⅓</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued)

revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall 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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(D) 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 benefit 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 subsection (b) of this section, and he has designed 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 subsection (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 allowances made pursuant to this subsection (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 subsection (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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 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 manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contributions 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.)

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(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.
(Proposition H, Continued)

(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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

“Retirement allowance,” “death allowance” or “allowance,” shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, or upon the day following the date of death, as the case may be, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

“Compensation earnable” shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member by Act of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

“Compensation earnable” shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of

remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “death allowance,” “death benefit” and “final compensation.”

“Final compensation” shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms “member of the police department,” “member of the department,” or “member” shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and Employees’ Retirement System as created in Section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement Board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, may retire on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. Any member retired after meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further, that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least 20 years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 marriage to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:

(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, or at the later date of a periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-
(Proposition 1, Continued)

tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers’ compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year.
A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided, however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

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

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as **requested by the member,** be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) **time and one-half** in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the **rate of time and one-half.**

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) **time and one-half** in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) **time and one-half** as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the **rate of time and one-half** ((in the judgment of the police commission)) as **requested by the member.**

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to **time and one-half** for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:
That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:
"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county," the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary
for conversion of such a system from municipal own-
ership to consumer ownership; and examination of
models of governance and management for such a
public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study
should also consider the alternative of a system which
provides electricity to the residential and industrial
sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than
to that portion of the city and county within the area
commonly known as the “Downtown Assessment Dis-
trict.” In addition to examining alternatives, the con-
tactor shall make recommendations from among the
alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency
and such other criteria as may be suggested by the
Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of
Supervisors.
2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned
in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of pas-
sage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall
authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility
study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and de-
termination of a contractor shall be made by the
Public Utilities Commission after public hearings con-
cerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out
the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of
this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall author-
ize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of
funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as
may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that
such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of
the Department, but instead be taken from revenues
normally available for funding of studies by the
Department. The contractor for such study shall be
directed to complete and present the study to the
Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10,
1984.
3. That, following submission of the completed fea-
sibility study to the city and county by the contractor,
the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of
acquisition, including condemnation of property and
bond authorization, before the people at the general
election next following submission of the study.
Should any provision of this ordinance for any rea-
son be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance
shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full
force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordi-
ance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent
the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for
above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:
It shall be the policy of the City and County of
San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the
public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general
wellfare and to protect the character and stability of
the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex
and the University of California Medical Center, and
to promote the orderly and beneficial development of
such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all
other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate
zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for
guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or
more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant,
cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and
other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty
housing units which can be sold at a fair market
price or rented at a fair rental market price. Further-
more, there shall be provisions for off-street parking
spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five
automobiles.
The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an
area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical com-
plex and medical center, which area is specifically de-
cscribed as follows:
That certain real property situated in the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
cscribed as follows:
PARCEL 1:
Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon “Map of
PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
cscribed as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 38.949 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 31.051 feet to the southerly line of said
Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57′20″ to the left and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of
32.664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20′34″ to the right
and running westerly 35.807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39′26″ to the
right and running northerly along said westerly line of
said Lot 45, a distance of 28.715 feet to the point of
beginning.
PARCEL 2:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon
“Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
cscribed as a whole as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 28.715 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 30.234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21′10″ to
the left and running easterly 35.808 feet; thence deflec-
ting 90°38′50″ to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 30.424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26′39″ to
the left and running westerly 35.807 feet to the point of
beginning.
PARCEL 3:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon
“Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
cscribed as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 58.949 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 31.051 feet to the southerly line of said
Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57′20″ to the left and running southerly along said southerly line of said Lot
45 and 46, a distance of 44.798 feet; thence deflecting
84°02′40″ to the left and running northerly parallel
with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26
feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence
BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 4:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:

PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 36 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:

Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
BART DISTRICTS
District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods: Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTER DE IMPRENTA

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

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

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

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

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on
My residence address is

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

MAIL TO:

ENVIO A:

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.,
TUESDAY, October 25
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS DOS EN PUNTO
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

FOR REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
SOLAMENTE PARA USO DEL REGISTRAR

Date
Deputy Registrar

Proc. No.________________________
Pat. Affil. n/a
Ballot No.________________________
Ballot Mailed_____________________
Ballot Returned___________________
Aff. Record_______________________
Inspector's Notice_________________
Signature and Registration
Verified as Correct:

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

如果你已遷居

如果你已遷居，現所居住地址不是你在

註冊選舉冊書上之住址，請填寫此表

格。

我已在一九____年____月____日遷居

我現在的住址是：__________________

郵遞號碼

注意：選民在此次選舉前二十日內遷居

者，可索取一份缺席選票。選民在

此次選舉前遷居超過二十日，而

在註冊選舉日期截止前沒有重新註

冊者，沒有資格選舉。
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### Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gobernador</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAN P. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian</td>
<td>商人</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>加州司法廳長</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH MARTINEZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>作家、編輯、組織人</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>洛杉磯市市長</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>專業貨運人員</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vicegobernador</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent</td>
<td>汽車商人</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MCCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>州衆議員</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian</td>
<td>餐館顧問／包辦伙食者</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>州黨書記</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL HALLETT, Republican</td>
<td>州議員／農民</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretario de Estado</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td>實業經紀</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON DUFFY, Republican</td>
<td>加州議員</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>貨倉工人</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>商業顧問</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>州務卿</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY GINGELI</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treasurer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS ANTMAN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN AKIN</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrer de Obra</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Analyst/Analista</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attorney General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, State Board of Equalization — 1st District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote by Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Board of Equalization, Atty General/Comisario de la Hacienda, Miembro nombrado, los distritos</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NUGREN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente contra los Impuestos</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. &quot;BILL&quot; IVERS</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisrador del Estado de California</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA &quot;TEEN&quot; DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>54 →</td>
<td>請選一名</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID WALT, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>55 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON, Republican</td>
<td>56 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>57 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR, Democratic</td>
<td>58 →</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative in Congress—5th District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td>62 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td>63 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian</td>
<td>64 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senator—8th Senatorial District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL E. MAYAKIS, Libertarian</td>
<td>69 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN F. FORAN, Democratic</td>
<td>70 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEANNE C. GUTH, Republican</td>
<td>71 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS, Democratic</td>
<td>75 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON A. BLOYER, Republican</td>
<td>76 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK K. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>Shall FRANK K. RICHARDSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá FRANK K. RICHARDSON ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTO M. KAUS</td>
<td>Shall OTTO M. KAUS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá OTTO M. KAUS ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN E. BROUSSARD</td>
<td>Shall ALLEN E. BROUSSARD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ALLEN E. BROUSSARD ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ REYNOSO</td>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá CRUZ REYNOSO ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>Shall JOHN T. RACANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá JOHN T. RACANELLI ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá JOSEPH R. GRODIN ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>Shall JOHN J. MILLER be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá JOHN J. MILLER ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>Shall JEROME A. SMITH be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES/SI 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá JEROME A. SMITH ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>Shall CLINTON WAYNE WHITE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>103 → YES/SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá CLINTON WAYNE WHITE ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1

**Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIASTELLI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8

**Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8** 灣區快車系統第八區董事

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRE</td>
<td>Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BARNES</td>
<td>Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKE</td>
<td>BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>124</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Jefe Contra Impuestos de Alcantarillado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
### Superintendent of Public Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Supervisora de Educación/Pública</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL HOMIC</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Supervisora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for no more than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA M. WILSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE I. O'BRIEN</td>
<td>Vice President/Presidente</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUMA</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raices</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPP</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for no more than Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL ROSSELLI</td>
<td>Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURT</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL S. BERNICK</td>
<td>Professor/Agency Director</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT A. Da PRATO</td>
<td>Physician, Educador/Médico, Educador</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEALAND MCGLEN</td>
<td>Administrator, MS, J.D./Administradora, MS, J.D.</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIDDEN</td>
<td>Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SOUERI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Misión YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. F. &quot;BELLE STARR&quot; MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raices, Consulor</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $200,000,000.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $85,000,000.</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

7 TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 211

NO 212

8 TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

YES 215

NO 216

9 SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

YES 220

NO 221

10 UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

YES 225

NO 226

11 BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 229

NO 230

12 NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 233

NO 234
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

TASACION. VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura excluir la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por reciclaje automático o sistemas de alarma de la definición de "reconstrucción". Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Cuando se instale: Pérdida desconocida para poderes locales de radicar impuestos a la propiedad y un aumento en los costos de evaluación. Un aumento desconocido en costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de radicación para escuelas, universidades y otros gobiernos locales. Un aumento menor en los radicados de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los descuentos de impuestos a la propiedad.

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambia las bases de límite y pago provenientes de los "impronables" a cobrar o "reales" e infraventurados. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Según el análisis, podría reducir los costos de interés de la financiación del gasto y, consecuentemente, reducir el interés que normalmente hubiera sido pagado por otras maneras de ingresos que de no reciban préstamos.

TEXTOS ESCOLARES. ESCUELAS NO PÚBLICAS: Autoriza la provincia de textos en una base de préstamo tipo bibliotecas a estudiantes de escuelas no públicas bajo condiciones preferenciales. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal hasta que se instale instrumentación. Al incurrirse en instrumentación, los costos anuales estatales podrían exceder $4 millones para un programa similar al de 1980-81 en los grados 4-6 y $1 millón en grados 9-12. Costos administrativos desconocidos.

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo a un voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal hasta que se instale instrumentación. Al incurrirse en instrumentación, estos costos aumentan y hasta el año 1980-81 podrían llegar a ser $2 millones. Costos estimados desconocidos. Se podrían prever variaciones sustanciales entre los condados.

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de reembolsos de cinco centavos a más que debe ser pagado al devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto neto fiscal. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y descenso de desperdicios sólidos y un aumento en la cantidad desconocida en colecciones de impuestos. Vea el cálculo del Análisis para explicación de las variables.

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador le escriba al Presidente para solicitar que se proporcione a la Unión Soviética un alto en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.
WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237 →
NO 238 →

REAPPORPTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reappportionment and establishes commission to reappportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241 →
NO 242 →

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245 →
NO 246 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249 →
NO 250 →

B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 3/4 of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256 →
NO 257 →

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

YES 259 →
NO 260 →
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permite asignaciones para ahorros financieros, oscura del Rio Stanislaus y reglamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de aguas fríeas. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos asociados de $1.48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativas y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de levantamiento; pérdida desconocida de ráfagas de orillones eléctricos y otros desconocimientos de fuga en costos reducidos para la edificación de una nueva. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

COMISION DE NUEVO PRORRA. Abaga el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo proyecto y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo proyecto de distritos legislativos y de igualización empeñando con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en pronunciamientos del Analista, habrá un aumento de costos estatales de $126,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable una vez cada 10 años empezando en 1991.


PROPÓSITOS DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO — 市縣提案

¿Debe establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malos conducta de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

¿Debería la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, excluirse de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deben exceder 5% de la venta de $100 de propiedad basada y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

¿Debe autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarlos para asistir a personas particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolso por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

¿Debe la ciudad subvencionar a los círculos subvencionables de los empleados estatales o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados estatales o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

≤ 237 SI 贊成
≤ 238 NO 反對
≤ 241 SI 贊成
≤ 242 NO 反對
≤ 245 SI 贊成
≤ 246 NO 反對
≤ 249 SI 贊成
≤ 250 NO 反對
≤ 252 SI 贊成
≤ 253 NO 反對
≤ 256 SI 贊成
≤ 257 NO 反對
≤ 259 SI 贊成
≤ 260 NO 反對
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E  Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?  YES 261  NO 262

PROPOSITION F HAS BEEN REMOVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

G  Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?  YES 267  NO 268

H  Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at $71/4% of the compensation of these employees?  YES 270  NO 271

I  Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?  YES 273  NO 274

J  Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?  YES 276  NO 277

K  Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?  YES 279  NO 280

L  Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?  YES 282  NO 283

M  Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?  YES 285  NO 286
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

---

261 SI 贊成

¿Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

---

262 NO 反對

---

263 SI 贊成

---

LA JUNTA DE SUPERVISORES A ELIMINAR LA PROPOSICION F

(市參議會撤消了F提案)

264 NO 反對

---

265 SI 贊成

¿Deberá pagarsele a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

---

266 NO 反對

---

267 SI 贊成

¿Deberé el tipo de contribución para los empleados militares de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse el 7½% de la compensación de estos empleados?

---

268 NO 反對

---

269 SI 贊成

¿Deberá crear un nuevo Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1º de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

---

270 NO 反對

---

271 SI 贊成

---

272 NO 反對

---

273 SI 贊成

¿Deberá pagarsele a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio, o deberá desatender tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajo en días festivos, según lo solicite el oficial?

---

274 NO 反對

---

275 SI 贊成

---

276 NO 反對

---

277 SI 贊成

¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de viabilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?

---

278 NO 反對

---

279 SI 贊成

¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco añadir cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificando la propiedad para su ubicación?

---

280 NO 反對

---

281 SI 贊成

---

282 NO 反對

---

283 SI 贊成

¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco afectar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificando la propiedad para su ubicación?

---

284 NO 反對

---

285 SI 贊成

---

286 NO 反對

---
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

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

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

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

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3)

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
- three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
- two State Senate Districts (SD 3, 8)
- two United States Congressional Districts (CD 5,6)

See map elsewhere in this pamphlet

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
- mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters’ handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

---

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney

My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olcomendy, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran, Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lacey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART’s improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I’m concerned about BART safety and San Francisco’s need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I’m a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary’s College; Master’s Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific’s payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53

My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART’s current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40

My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant

My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:

— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.

— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.

— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: “The people don’t care.”

— “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.

— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).

— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.

— Silvestri favors police “decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.

— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who’s Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.

— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.

— For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

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

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above

My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way! Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32


Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randall Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. “Jays” Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-34th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1085 Lombard, Antiques Dealer
Christian H. Keith, 325-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Annie Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Proletarian
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Paul W. Kirsteich, 33 Pearl, Soup Rep.
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffitt St., Security Guard
Larry G. Yetts, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 600 Kansas St., Lumber Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Eilson, 759-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carlo M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Begin, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Paige, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thompson, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welie, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Bihl, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shradar, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary J. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Reallors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dobson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Galligan, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chester St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Footherode Kiln, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F.
P.U.C.

Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1425 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margarette Riordan, 1425 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everston St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Toberman, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Daneshim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Beisele Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Hume Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scantion, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilites, Minister
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36

Diana Coleman

GREG DAY
My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist
My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality ... safer neighborhoods ... stronger rent control ... affordable housing ... control downtown growth ... employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1325-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Cosk..<., 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larren, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3161 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth A. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welke, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Roman St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shadr St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

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

JERRY R. De YOUNG
My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilacien, 68 Waterville St., Distribution Att’d Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Plk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst/Secretary
Steven Sama, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stumbersky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Summer St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON
My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond L. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Broshera, 357-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St. Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Conrardt, 631 O’Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carloita Teshad Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
Jo Ann Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSR
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Linn P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, 52, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samarzes, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scallon, 635 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinsley, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

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

MARTIN LEE ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.
My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.
I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.
Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.
Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.
All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:

Ted Akne, 1882 Green St, Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St, C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Ruddien Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Petersilie, 663 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenholt, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strauss, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER

My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:

Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Belliveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jurett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irina Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliott, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kernblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pisch, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Burleigh St., Houseman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I’m concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lisa Triff Bell, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvike, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Amy Cunco, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belisle Daley, 790 Geary Blvd., Executive Director Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jesse T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1685 Eureka St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1710 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library Commission
Lenore King, 75 Tampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shattner Ave., Retired
John L. Molnar, 1328 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arbuckle Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Folsom, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terr Vieta Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew “Daddy Andy” Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 981 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 981 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinskey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 981 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 907 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 4th St., Intake Interviewer
Roie Macellari, 981 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Detor
Connie Rucker, 1426 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachelle Cottonreader, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:
Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurantant
Lenore Cattretre, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Bernal, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Huston, 533 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 203 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Mullock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 5241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 880 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Pauporte, 1826 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo
My occupation is Urban Planner
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn’t do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:
Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Bealey, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morrie J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grunet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philmene Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jenson, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kaiman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 4118A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Polkom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1139 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California’s major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Asaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Caper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Connors, 145 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 17 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Labor’s Union
George Foss, 170 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenbarg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3392 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1831-8th Ave., Board Member,
Na until Women’s Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 132 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 450, Francisco Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., 94 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer’s Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-26th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-30th St Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave, U.C. Regent

BETTY ANN McMAHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Francisco who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco’s future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:

Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Curran, 2530 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Fonblad, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Hoff, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances F. Melaney, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocco, 175 Landsdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocco, 175 Landsdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapiro, 66 Sotole Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scannan, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1603-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Robert Stewart, 161 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Sharer St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

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

ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman

My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur.

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:

Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Amerie Azevedo, 269 Chenery St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Mebane F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Dudum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Lockeley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alanna Hartkoz, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hirabayashi, 377 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Suhourteh, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schier, 550 Turk St., Research Assistant
E.R. Sorofani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Moutcillo, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vag, 39 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shiplay St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.

I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:

Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Pauline Burt, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loretta D. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Circe Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paula "Ralf" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave, Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitenaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen's Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:
- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable.
- Creating needed services for seniors.
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
- Assuring healthful drinking water.
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 395 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Jim Sharp, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 45 Elsie St., Director, Sr. Volunteer Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lefty” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4002-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women’s Organization
Thomas C. Seuninck, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr, 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St, Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolindo, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It’s time for a change!

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:

Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boscetti, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOseana, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickerson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gulbig, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 13 Garcia Ave., Munl Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Researcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Keibene, 2675-43rd Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Reddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 52 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OLGA TALAMANTE

My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO

My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:

Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Goselin, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudibburgh, 2724 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Iishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franceena, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Mallett, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Mallett, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purcell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabasa, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emmet Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldamando, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert W. Williams, 1509 Shrader, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 253 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:

Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John D. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 2578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68% Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-30th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latino, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SPFDP, Past CMDR VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur's Union Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union Local 38
John Vibeig, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters Local 860
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

BEN TOM
My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city’s communities, leaders and constituencies.
I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-406 Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Ducu, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaids, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacifie, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holte, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denehne, 200 S. Francais Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., President I.L.W.U.
Russ S. Kaudish, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 403 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Dio, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Youittada Wada, 656-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrabamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER
My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California
Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadr, Planning Commissioner
Al Bercine, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Buscher, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanly St., Commissioner
Joseph Frielis, Jr., 3360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachter, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestrri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Blane Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymondo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eveson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 563-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Reene, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silber, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Eucalp Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Bovie, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amons C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Prés. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimares, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hornd, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodward, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 631 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomatra N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Warters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42

San Francisco needs a new voice.
I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.
Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bode Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Morimat Fleishacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 256 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garell, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrer St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconi, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morton, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nordera, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assst., City of S.F.
Ramsay B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neport, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Hern, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscape
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2200 Van Ness, Account Executive

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

ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Aigner, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janel Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Goosby, 259 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Demail St., Airport Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3352 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinarl, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocan, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefancie, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRITCHTON DeOSUNA
My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government’s Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3609-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. Mitch, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Crichton, 350 Arballo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohammed Nour Taghi-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Lockeley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mipah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkorth, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Moone, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cotonaro, 93 Therese St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cotonaro, 93 Therese St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flore, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon P. Navarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Petitt, 30 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 316-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:

New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students’ and teachers’ programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:

Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimmun, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSR
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSR
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth J. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Hornor, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barcojo, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dung, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Supt.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Palli, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stucke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swannom, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tessman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weedy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zidko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flott, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O’Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agnipino Cerbatics, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Texidor Del Portillo, 64 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Deneheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Goooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 151 Eastwood St., Community Leader
Thomas Heish, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margie Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature

Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Moisan, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemerovsky, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burt Toler, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor

My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don't want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statistic bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn't!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 3½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2340 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willeie Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation

Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minster
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Melton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Glyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gobey, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1539 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 13th Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddox Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minster
CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director

My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sporsors for Robert R. Bacci are:

Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgart, 1 Aztex, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossie Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Diggwill, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St, Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Walter G. Jebb, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Willard, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association
President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2995 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terhedyen, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vasksich, 177 San Aleso Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1476-52nd Ave, Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agrupino R. Cerbato, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Bookter T. Washington Center
Zaretti Goody, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Hales, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lucedo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zuma Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearny, Planner
Issodore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 736-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stullings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT E. BURTON
My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.
My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:
Booker T. Anderson, 1775 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women's Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dobson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President ILWU
Alhene C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Ajar Juaca, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Korum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 228 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riond, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everon Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO
My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:
— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.
— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.
— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Fillbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Perton, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O'Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goelitz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goelitz, 130 Cliffd Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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CAROLE MIGDEN
My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fund raising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
— to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
— to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
— to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population. 

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Brunso, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agrinino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Education Board Member
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Eliazer, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Marcia L. Hunt, 146-15th Ave., Public Affairs/Information
S.F.U.S.D.
Agar Jucks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Arnold Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jertroll Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomata N. Scott, 1911 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arl Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLEN,
M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:
George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tsao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
Jo Anne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Madachian, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kielwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 766-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Babara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merij, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1690 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilyn Sperber, 2065 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trovers, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gamon, 4188 Morea St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
JOHN RIOR DAN
My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

SAL ROSELLI
My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 5252-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idaora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary L. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preson Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Potola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airport Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotheodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2565 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.

Chilton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Geneviève Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence P. Shin, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobra, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. “Jack” Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Mileставил, Minister

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denbeheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boscheto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Beisile Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director L.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waler St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1497-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaske Murphy, 2235 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukisch, 177-10th Ave., Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritaka Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Milestitial, Minister

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA

My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master’s Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chiu, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Gosby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Fire C. Hernandez, 820 47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molnar, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 583-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilltops St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER:

City Hall.

Work at the polls on election day. Apply now in Room 155.

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

ansam mismoul

Oficina 155 de la Academia de la Ciudad.

Las elecciones. Obra una solicitud en la mesa en los lugares de votación de la ciudad.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A

Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens' complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators' salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens' complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981—reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money, which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That's just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Being a cop is tough work—and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Jo Daly
Police Commissioner

Michael Hennessey
Sheriff

Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.’s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.’s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department’s disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer’s authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A


— MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don’t demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

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

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda “Committee for Economic Democracy” proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of “fat” APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the “POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT” are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled its efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can “dream up” more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960’s that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a “cure-all”, but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

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

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

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


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

The Full Legal Text of Proposition C Appears on Page 88.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today's high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs . . . Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco's Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco's dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!

Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlate Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco
Endorsed by:
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Richard D. Hongisto
Lee Dolson
Wendy Nelder
Carol Ruth Silver
Harry G. Britt
Nancy G. Walker
Willie B. Kennedy
Doris M. Ward
F. Walter Johnson
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

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

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one “provider” and one “dependent” in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition “E” are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote “YES” on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse’s life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: “The costs cannot be accurately determined.”

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said “Quote” “The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it’s a new field. We have no actuarial data.”

“We also do not know how many people the plan would affect.”

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:

William T. Reed

PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller's Statement on "G"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of (($9,600)) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $3,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it's the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors' current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere "token."

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors' salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco's taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON "G"

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS' SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccari

Nicholas Sagunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antemore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermoso
Willis Hannawalt
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right; during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorsen
Martin A. Felthauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sotz
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Aloyius J. Smyth
Joan Willemsen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emolyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jebe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Groth

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Haila
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Bessie Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farbstein
John and Madeleine Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibeck
Dorothy Nisley
Caroline Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramus
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppigite
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carli
Rita Dallamonti
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garibaldi
Helen Vergas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Marcet
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Czan
Walter G. Jebe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerold Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Lussielle
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongier
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Halberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walker and Kathleen Glynn
Walker and Fern Fayling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Loma Foller
William McGrath

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor's salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

- The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

- Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

- People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

- A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

- Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G; after 18 years it's the responsible thing to do.

_Cyril Magnin_

---

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let's break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually $ 105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per

$21,450 annually times 11 235,950

Total $ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

_Edna Mae Martin_

Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote “NO”!!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate _Bob Geary_ (Democratic Committeeman)
Former City Commissioner _Terence Faulkner_

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

What _QUENTIN KOPP_ said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors' pay to 25% of the Mayor's salary): “The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time.”

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— _BART Candidate Robert Silvestri_
  (Republican Committeeman)
— _Terence Faulkner_ (Republican Committeeman)

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

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide “Fixed” employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on “age at entry” into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on “age at entry” is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a “fixed” rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, “age at entry” rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City’s rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly, for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years’ cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers’ Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

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

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,

(Continued on page 90)
PROPPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The challenge of effective law enforcement in today's society of high and rising crime rates requires competent men and women from all backgrounds and walks of life. At a cost of approximately .99 cents a month, you can help create one fair system of compensation and at the same time help the San Francisco Police Department become competitive in recruiting the finest people for the job.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Bob Barry
President S.F. Police Officers Association
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore
Gordon Lau
Former Supervisor
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
Chuck Ayala
Director, C.Y.O.
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
John Foran
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour’s pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour’s pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

John Foran
State Senator
6th District
Jo Daly
San Francisco Police Commissioner

Arthur Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District
Chuck Ayala
Director C.Y.O.
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
5th Congressional District

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Assembly
Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris M. Ward
Supervisor
C/C San Francisco
Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeeman)

Democratic Committeeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED
Electric Utility Ownership

PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF “K” — SEE PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E's Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you're right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 "public power" cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn't pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city's hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy's cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go "public power". And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.
SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto (public)</td>
<td>$11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding (public)</td>
<td>$12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (public)</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Baker
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borice
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lola Carter
Manuel Ceballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Conny Ford
Eulalia Frausto
Corinne Frongi
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zaretti Goosby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallinan
Sus Huster
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Allison Brennan Kwasnik
David Looman
Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shank
Stanley Shields
James Shoch
Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Siern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caran Wyland
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E’s electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardney, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Norcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schults, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote "YES"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait ’til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON "K"

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be, mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we’d have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we’d be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930’s, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON "K"

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kapp

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our potholed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated all existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as $15 million).
*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).
*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.
*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).
*A huge new City administrative staff.
*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION "K"

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don't vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. "K"

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City's payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility's franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City's financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)

Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)
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Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
City Hall Ramps

PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote “Yes” on Proposition “L”. Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote “Yes” on “L”.

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers’ money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco’s world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer’s dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The “Can’t use the side door” fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an asymmetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113′ uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient “off-street” access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on “symbolism” to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, “costs be damned” career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to “butcher” the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn’t enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls...A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition "L" denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition "L" would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition "L" is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on "L" for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamente, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor's Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Westa Whitfield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanagh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodeltaw
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trajillo
Jane McKaste Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panthers
Tim Woford, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatrical Rhetoricians
Dmitri Belser
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokooff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Biernan, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rubberg
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
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OOPS!

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.

PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities.

Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madey Samarzes, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco's housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project's site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O'Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O'Connell

William Separatis
David Finn
Sylvia Durance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Wills
June Sanchez

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

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery

E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery

Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery

Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology

Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine

Devron Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology

Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology

Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology

Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology

Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery

William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery

Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research

Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry

Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology

Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine

Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Steinman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology

John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology

Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology

Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman

Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION Supports THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

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

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

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco’s housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Souls
Gene Prat
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:
VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco’s tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People

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

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardis Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed “medically oriented” use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other “ancillary commercial areas” in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote “NO” on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote “NO” on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCOISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-Ashbury IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-Ashbury NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioneers and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-crowded, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Booer
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Mile Cucek
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandson
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Ann Gold Gilliam
Dr. Sadia Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill
Ellen Huppert
Peter Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lakanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Mathew LaVail
Margaret Northcott
Kenny O'Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salan
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeeman)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner
3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
(Proposition A, Continued)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while ensuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

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

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall (in amount not to) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
(Proposition B, Continued)

shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require: (2) for repairs and maintenance: (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described: (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions: (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.)) (End)

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION C**

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

7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)
the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” and “death benefit.”

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the term “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 purposes of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6750</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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued)

reduction, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty, and provided further that as to any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 credit in said retirement system in the aggregate, as provided in subsection (G) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection (A) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

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

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

(1) If no benefit 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 subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) 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
(Proposition H, Continued)

spouse, who was entitled to make the election herein
provided, shall die before or after making such elec-
tion 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 sub-
section (E), any allowance payable under this subdivi-
sion (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 em-
ployment and reemployment with and without rede-
posit 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 contribu-
tions 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 con-
tributions 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 ir-
revocable election to withdraw his accumulated con-
tributions. A person who elects to allow his ac-
cumulated contributions to remain in the retirement
fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as
apply to other members under this section for service
retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum
service requirement. Upon the qualification of such
member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be
entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall
be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated con-
tributions and an equal amount of the contributions
of the city and county, plus 1\% percent of his average
final compensation for each year of service credited to
him as rendered prior to his first membership in the
retirement system. Upon the death of such member
prior to retirement, his contributions with interest
credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or design-
nated beneficiary.

(G) The following time and service shall be includ-
ed 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 em-
ployee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which
is not credited as service of a member—under this sec-
tion 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 con-
tribution 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 if he had been a miscellaneous employee
throughout the period of his service in either of such
departments at the compensation he received in such
departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from
a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next
preceding which is not deemed absence from service
under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter
and for which such member is entitled to receive
credit as service for the city and county by virtue of
contributions made in accordance with the provisions
of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as pre-
scribed by the board of supervisors for persons who
are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 retire-
ment system. The normal rate of contribution of
each 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: assum-
ing 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 beca
use 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 manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.)

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions by the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under disability investment and other components, 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 July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(I) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in subsection (B) 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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 herefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION I**

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

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

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

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

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the minimum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences preceding shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least 20 years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from such injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was
for such disability, and if death occurred prior to
qualification for the service retirement allowance, the
allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date
which said member would have qualified for ser-
vice retirement, in the same manner as it would have
been reduced had the member not died. If there be
no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereun-
der, or if they die or remarry before every child of
such deceased member attains the age of eighteen
years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse
would have received had they lived and not remarried
shall be paid to the 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 surviv-
ing spouse and no children under the age of eighteen
years, but leave a parent or parents dependent upon
him for support, the parents so dependent shall col-
lectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that
which a surviving spouse otherwise would have
received, during such dependency. No allowance, how-
ever, shall be paid under this section to a surviving
spouse following the death of a member unless they
were married to the member prior to the date of the
injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police depart-
ment resulting from any cause, other than an injury
received in or illness caused by performance of duty,
(a) if his death occurred after qualification for service
retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement
for service or because of disability which resulted
from any cause other than injury received in or il-
ness 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 al-
lowance as it was at his death, as the case may be,
shall be continued throughout life or until marriage,
to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred
after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of
service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retire-
ment allowance to which he would have been entitled
under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout
life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c)
if his death occurred after retirement for disability by
reason of injury received in or illness caused by per-
formance of duty, his retirement allowance as it was
at his death shall be continued throughout life or un-
til remarriage, to his surviving spouse, except that, if
death occurred prior to qualification for service retire-
ment allowance, the allowance continued shall be ad-
justed upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after
completion of at least ten years of service in the ag-
gregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an
allowance in an amount equal to the retirement al-
lowance to which the member would have been enti-
tled pursuant to section 8.590-3 if he had retired on
the date of death, because of incapacity for perfor-
ance of duty resulting from a cause other than
bodily injury received in or illness caused by perfor-
ance of duty shall be paid throughout life or until
remarriage to his surviving spouse. If there be no sur-
viving spouse entitled to an allowance hereun-
der, or if they die or remarry before every child of
such deceased member attains the age of eighteen
years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse
would have received had they 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 surviv-
ing spouse and no children under age of eighteen
years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of
age, dependent upon him for support because partially
or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or
a parent or parents dependent upon him for support,
the child or children and the parents so dependent
shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to
that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have
received, during such dependency. No allowance, how-
ever, shall be paid under this section to a surviving
spouse unless she was married to the member prior to
the date of injury or onset of the illness which results
in death if he had not retired, or unless she was mar-
ried to the member at least one year prior to his
death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, “surviv-
ing spouse” shall 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 remar-
ried.

The surviving spouse, in the event of death of the
member after qualification for but before service retire-
ment, may elect before the first payment of the al-
lowance, to receive the benefit provided in section
8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise
would be continued to her under this section, if there
be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible
child or children may make such election, and if
there be no such children, the dependent parent or
parents may make such election. “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 per-
sons who are members under section 8.590 are sub-
ject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of
service, said service to be computed under section
8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or
on account of any member under section 8.590 shall
be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on
July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal
to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respec-
tively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the
rank or position upon which such retirement or death
allowance was based; provided, however, that no al-
lowance shall be reduced below the amount being
received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30,
1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary
began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of
the death or retirement of any member of the police
department which is provided by contributions of the
city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed
by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any
benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
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city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:

(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during the said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, 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 to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-
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8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contribution at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.539 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filling in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might accrue to him under Charter Section 8.539 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section.

In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
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fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year.

A member of the police department shall receive credit as service under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided,

however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

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

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half ((in the judgment of the police commission)) as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

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

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county;"

the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment District." In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to protect the character and stability of the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:

That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL 1:
Poritions of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35,808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2:
Portions of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2,95 feet; thence

and running westerly 35,807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point of beginning.
(Proposition M, Continued)
at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle
westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly
5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and
running westerly 33.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon
"Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City
and County of San Francisco, State of California,
described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said
Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the
southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly
along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of
56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence
deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly
along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a
distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20"
to the right and running northerly parallel with the
easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence
at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right
angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly
5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet;
and thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running
easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:
PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon
"Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22
and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City
and County of San Francisco, State of California,
described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the
southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of
Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly
along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence
deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly
parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a dis-
tance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05"
to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easter-
ly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55"
to the left and running northerly along said easterly line
of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point
of beginning.

PARCEL 6:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same
are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that
certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights",
filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of
the City and County of San Francisco, State of
California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23,
described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of
Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly
from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running
thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue
25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line
of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel
with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and
thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl
Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same
are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that
certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights,"
filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages
22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City
and County of San Francisco, State of California,
described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of
Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly
from the point formed by the intersection of the easter-
y line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line
of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said
easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easter-
ly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street
100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly
line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly
parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54
feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are
laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain
map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16,
1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in
the office of the County Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California,
described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of
Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly
from a point formed by the intersection of the easter-
y line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of
Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easter-
y line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly
parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54
feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line
of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel
with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet
to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:
BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of
Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly
from the point formed by the intersection of the easter-
y line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line
of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along
said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly
parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54
feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line
of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel
with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet
to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point
of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear meas-
urements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS,
as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office
of the County Recorder of the City and County of
San Francisco, State of California, and of record in
Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:
Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on
that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights,
San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for
record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, on July
16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.
Also known as ASSessor'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35,
36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46,
of Block 1275.
NOTE.

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.
District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods: Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.
On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
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<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan P. Dougherty</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman, Comerciante</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George &quot;Duke&quot; Deukmejian</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney General of California/Fiscal General of California</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Martinez</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Bradley</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcaldesa Los Angeles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James C. Griffin</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Professional Trucker/Caminero</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston A. Myers</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Auto Businessman, Comerciante de Automóviles</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo T. Mc Carthy</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Vernon</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Restaurant Consultant/Caterer</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Kuhn</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>State Party Secretary, Secretario Estatal de Partido Politico</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Hallett</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>State Legislator/Panista, Legislativo de Agricultura</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfred W. Smith</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker, Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Duffy</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator, Legislador de California</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Shiho Takei</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Warehouse Worker, Trabajador de Almacén</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin E. Buenger</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Business Consultant, Consultor de Comercio</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Fong Eu</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Controller (Officer of the State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY GINGELL</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Treasurer (Officer of the State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS ANTMAN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN AKIN</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrero de Obra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. CHALTON</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Analyze/Analista</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attorney General (Officer of the State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMOWE (BART) LEE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, State Board of Equalization — 1st District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Board of Equalization, Angeles County, Muestra de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NGREN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. &quot;BILL&quot; IVERS</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisador del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theresa &quot;Tena&quot; Dietrich, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wald, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro 太陽能工程師，教師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Wilson, Republican</td>
<td>Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego 圣地亚哥市市長</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Fuhrig, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía 経済學教授</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund G. Brown Jr., Democratic</td>
<td>Governor of California/Gobernador de California 加州州長</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Representative in Congress — 6th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Boxer, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard C. Creighton, Libertarian</td>
<td>Mortgage Banker/Banquero Hipotecario 抵押銀行家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy-Allen Albertson, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Law Clerk/Clergyman/Empleado de Oficina Jurídica/Clérigo 法律文員／教士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Mc Quaid, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Member of the Assembly — 16th Assembly District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Agnos, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon A. Bloyer, Republican</td>
<td>Management Consultant/Consultor de Gerente 管理顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall FRANK K. RICHARDSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 79 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé FRANK K. RICHARDSON ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 80 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall OTTO M. KAUS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 82 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé OTTO M. KAUS ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 83 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ALLEN E. BROUSSARD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 85 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé ALLEN E. BROUSSARD ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 86 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOSO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 88 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé CRUZ REYNOSO ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 89 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Una 上訴法院主席法官 第一上訴區，第一分區</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN T. RACANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 91 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé JOHN T. RACANELLI ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 92 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Dos 上訴法院主席法官 第一上訴區，第二分區</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 94 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé JOSEPH R. GRODIN ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 95 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN J. MILLER be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 97 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé JOHN J. MILLER ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 98 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JEROME A. SMITH be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 YES/SI 100 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé JEROME A. SMITH ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 NO 101 →</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Tres 上訴法院主席法官 第一上訴區，第三分區</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CLINTON WAYNE WHITE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 恆否在法律指定之任 贊成 103 → YES/SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberé CLINTON WAYNE WHITE ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 期內選任本公職？ 反對 104 → NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal</td>
<td>Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District, Division Three</td>
<td>Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Tres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall BETTY BARRY-DEAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>** primera del Tribunal de Apelación, División Tres**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>¿Deberá BETTY BARRY-DEAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td><strong>ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall WINSLOW CHRISTIAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>¿Deberá WINSLOW CHRISTIAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>** ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shall MARC POCHE</strong></td>
<td><strong>¿Deberá MARC POCHE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>** ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1**

**Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</th>
<th><strong>MARC POCHE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td><strong>ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI</td>
<td>** ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td><strong>ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Superintendente de Instrucciones Públicas

WILSON RILES
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Presidente Estatal de Instrucciones Públicas

BILL HONIG
District School Superintendent/Presidente de Distrito Escolar

Vote for One
Puede votar por uno

Vote for One
Vote por uno

Member, Board of Education

Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco

SODONIA M. WILSON
Incumbent/En el Cargo 現任教務局委員

ROSARIO ANAYA
President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente Junta de Educación de San Francisco 舊金山教育局主席

WILLIAM FELZER
Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería 工程教育家

GEORGE L. O'BRIEN
Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces 自由教育者—經紀商

MARGARET CRITCHON DeOSUNA
Incumbent/En el Cargo 現任教務局委員

MYRA KOPF
Incumbent/En el Cargo 現任教務局委員

Vote for no more than Three
Puede votar por no más de tres

Member, Community College Board

Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad de San Francisco

ALAN S. WONG
Incumbent/En el Cargo 現任教務社大校董

SAL ROSSELLI
Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios 商業經理

JOHN RIOJAN
Incumbent/En el Cargo 現任教務社大校董

ROBERT E. BURTON
Incumbent/En el Cargo 現任教務社大校董

ROBERT R. BACCI
Lawyer/Abogado 律師

MICHAEL S. BERNICK
Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/ Director de Agencia 教授／機構主任

ROBERT A. DaPRATO
Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador 醫生／教育家

LELAND MOGLEN
Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D. 醫院行政人員

CAROLE MIDDEN
Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal 管理人員／經計策劃
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for no more than Five</th>
<th>市参議員</th>
<th>最多限選五名</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Siadacito Socialista</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Publico</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>公共服務律師</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY C. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUERI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>獨立商人</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>旅館侍者</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Misión YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>米撒街基督教男青年會主任</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>稅務顧問</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>舊金山教育委員</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>房屋問題活動份子</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher//Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>商人／聖經傳道者</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>犯罪學學生</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>社會主義聯盟鬥士</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>上天女修士</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>社區活躍人士，新聞從業員</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer//Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>文字處理員／作家</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>音樂家、作曲家</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>校區顧問</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>教育委員</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Artyist/Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>藝術家、律師、活動分子</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultant</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>實業評值員、顧問</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982.** This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

   - **FOR:** 186
   - **AGAINST:** 187

2. **COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981.** This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.

   - **FOR:** 190
   - **AGAINST:** 191

3. **VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982.** This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.

   - **FOR:** 194
   - **AGAINST:** 195

4. **LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT.** This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $85,000,000.

   - **FOR:** 198
   - **AGAINST:** 199

5. **FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982.** This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.

   - **FOR:** 202
   - **AGAINST:** 203

6. **PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT.** Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.

   - **YES:** 206
   - **NO:** 207
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Proponente</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolsos de capital para la construcción o mejoría de escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCÉLES DE CONDADO DE 1981. Esta acta permite la construcución, reconstrucción, remodelaje y requiezo de cárcel de condado y ejecución de mantenimiento similar en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE. Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Cuenca de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar los valores pintorescos y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es $85,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRADORES DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>INVERSIÓN DE FONDOS DE PENSION PÚBLICOS. Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos preferenciales de acciones comunes. Prescribe normas de inversión fiduciaria y limita pago de ingresos en división de oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañadas por riesgo mayor para los fondos participantes, lo cual podría acarrear pérdidas capitales para los fondos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION.</strong> Allows Legislature to exclude</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from &quot;newly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constructed&quot; definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE.</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes limit and repayment basis from accruing &quot;taxes&quot; to anticipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;revenues&quot;. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS.</strong> Authorizes provision of</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-6, and $1 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS.</strong> Legislature may</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide for unity of courts within a county after county electors'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savings, which could vary substantially between counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEVERAGE CONTAINERS.</strong> Requires each have refund value of five cents</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact: Not fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion of variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUCLEAR WEAPONS.</strong> Requires Governor write President urging</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TASACION, VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura excluir la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por roció automática o sistemas de alarma de la definición de "edificación construida". Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumente: Pérdida económica para poblaciones locales de los derechos de impuestos a la propiedad y un aumento en los costos de evaluación. Un aumento desconocido en costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de ingresos para escuelas, universidades, bienes comunales y, posiblemente, otras gobiernos locales. Un aumento menor en los recibos de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los descuentos de impuestos a la propiedad.

地方府政府制部と移動資金を用いた維持、改良制限、削減基準が記載された「税制」はどう改定した。「財政影響」に関する影響は、直接財政影響、照査会の評価基準、それが、もう少し税制の負担を軽減する、反対ね、非税制機関に関わる利益の削減は、削減後、削減前、地区の増加を、削減された、削減を削減した。

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambia las bases de límite y pago preventivos de "impuentes" acumulativos a "fideítos" esperados. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Según detalle el Analista, podría reducir los costos de interés de la deuda que paga el "prestamista" y, consecuentemente, reducir el interés que normalmente habría sido generado de otra manera por agencias que no reciben préstamos.

TEXTOS ESCOLARES. ESCUELAS PUBLICAS. Autoriza la elaboración de texto en una base de préstamo tipo biblioteca para estudiantes de escuelas públicas bajo condición de requerir la adquisición de textos en la forma de préstamo. Al instrumentarse, los costos anuales de los préstamos deberán exceder $4 millones para un programa similar al de 1980-81 en los grados K-8, y $1 millón en grados 9-12. Costos administrativos desconocidos.

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo a voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Al instrumentarse, costos aumentados de salario y jubilación para el estado y/o los condados para los jueces alegados, y costos administrativos desconocidos a abusos, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada una tenga un valor de reclamo de cinco centavos o más que debe ser determinado al efecto neta fiscal. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y detección de desperdicios sólidos y un aumento en algunas disminuciones de cantidad desconocidas en colecciones de derechos de impuestos. Vea el cálculo del Analista para explicación de las variables.

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador le escriba al Congreso una vez que se pronuncie a la Unión Soviética un alto en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.

飲料容器を、規定通りの容器、可獲得5%または5%以上の防犯倉庫。財政影響、総の財政影響、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能でしょう、可能ましょう。
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WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.18 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst’s estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237 →
NO 238 →

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature’s power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241 →
NO 242 →

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst’s estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245 →
NO 246 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249 →
NO 250 →

B Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 3/4 of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

C Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256 →
NO 257 →

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

YES 259 →
NO 260 →
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RECUREOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatuos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permite asignaciones para agua potable, uso del rio San Francisco y regulación del consumo escrito crítico de aguas recreativas. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1,48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumen-
tación; costos desconocidos de litigación; pérdida desconocida de réditos de arriendo electricos y alquiler desconocidos de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

COMISION DE NUEVO PROPRATE. Abre el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo proprato y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo proprato de distritos legistativos y de igualización empezando con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en pronunciaciones del Analista, habría un aumento de costos administrativos de $126,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable cada 10 años empezando en 1991.

ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la realización de registros de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidos en el Estaño. Prohibe la prescripción legislativa absoluta de la posesión de armas de fuego. Impacto fiscal: Impacto imposible de determinar. Aumentaría el costo administrativo reembolsado si se combinase en conjunto con otras propuestas. Impacto desconocido sobre el mercado de armas. Impediría el manejo de armas de fuego y la venta y la renta. Vea el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los factores.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

A. ¿Debe establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quales de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

B. ¿Debe la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Operating, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, que de la limitación de que los costos capitales no deben exceder de 1% de cada $100 de aportes de propiedad basado y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

C. ¿Debe autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarles para ayudar a partes particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolsos por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda o obligación sobre la Ciudad?

D. ¿Debe la ciudad subvencionar a los códigos sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados, pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

A. ¿Desea que la ciudad subvencione a los códigos sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados, pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

B. ¿Desea que la ciudad subvencione a los códigos sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados, pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

C. ¿Desea que la ciudad subvencione a los códigos sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados, pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

D. ¿Desea que la ciudad subvencione a los códigos sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados, pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION F HAS BEEN REMOVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

E ¿Se deberá permitir el cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión el casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

267 SI 贊成
268 NO 反對

G ¿Deberá pagarse a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

— 每一市参議員應否發給年薪 $23,924 元的

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

H ¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados misceláneos de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse al 7½% de la compensación de estos empleados?

— 市雜務員工對退休制度的捐納額，應否定為其薪額的 7½ %?

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

I ¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1 de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

— 警察局在 1982 年 11 月 1 日之後僱用的

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

J ¿Deberá pagarse a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberá otorgarse tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajos extras o por trabajo en días feriados, según lo solicite el oficial?

— 警員加班或在假日執行職務，應否每小時

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

K ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se afecte un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a la ciudad en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?

— 市參議會應否訂出各種步驟和目標，調查

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

L ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores de la Ciudad y Cenaida de San Francisco su construir campos de estacionamiento en la entrada a City Hall, bien sea la ubicación en la Calle Polk o la ubicación en Avenida Van Ness?

— 市政府大廈在樓街及閣街的入口處不修建

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

M ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Cenaida de San Francisco efectuar cambios de denominación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificando la propiedad para su utilización?

— 爲了批准在巴納薩斯岡醫藥綜合大樓和加
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LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#16—Area East of □□□□ (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN □□□□ (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of □□□□ (solid lines)

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

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADED area □□□□
#6—All the SHADED area □□□□

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER

By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3)

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
• three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
• two State Senate Districts (SD 3, 8)
• two United States Congressional Districts (CD 5,6)
See map elsewhere in this pamphlet

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The voting will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
• mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters' handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

 POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

---

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
ALFRED G. CHIANTelli

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney
My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Oloemendi, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing; Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Morgan Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lacey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committee, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now-President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4), 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART’s current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE
Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant

My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:
— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: “The people don’t care.”
— “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police “decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who’s Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

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

SISTER BOOM BOOM
My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.
Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.
Insane? That's what people say about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him -- take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!
Am I supe yet?

Richard Bradley
My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:
Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glazer, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christiann H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apotheic Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1330 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coskay, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellis, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloe M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physican
Katherine G. Gokan, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 235-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomson, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE
AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer’s error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli’s sponsors have been listed under John Riordan’s statements of qualifications and John Riordan’s sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli’s statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrac, Planning Commissioner
Robert B. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker’s Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripton, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fthéodore Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margarette Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Sholley, 70 Everston St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada 365-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John W. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louse H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Daneboim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Amiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Betchetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobeltz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hunt, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director L.W.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Weller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane Mckaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Oye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O’B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scallion, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vaskich, 177 Aloe, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoriada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. “Jack” Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Ceci Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister
DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36


Diana Coleman

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist

My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality . . . safer neighborhoods . . . stronger rent control . . . affordable housing . . . control downtown growth . . . employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 1309-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Conah, 955 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goolsby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1886 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 311 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Ann R. Thomson, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Wolfe, 3-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 353-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres, Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Rome Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 5476-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shadrer St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres, Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vasquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfe, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

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

JERRY R. De YOUNG
My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347-A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Fetherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Ass't.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilacion, 88 Watervile St., Distibution Att’d Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hanover St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Ass't/Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stambersky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weissbecker, 42 Sunner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON
My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Background: Native San Franciscan. Combat Veteran WWII-Korea. Master’s Degree, San Francisco State; Second Master’s and Ph.D., U.C., Berkeley. Taught Balboa High, City College, 1955-Present. Served as San Francisco Supervisor and School Board Member-President. Married, three children.

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Aloito, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond L. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruscheria, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Conradi, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Franco, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAtter, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucho C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samarzes, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

Kenneth L. Farmer
My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Belliveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jarett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irma Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliot, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornbluth, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitts, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Tunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman

The Sponsors for Martin Eng are:
Ted Aksnes, 1882 Green St., Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terril L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2930 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Feng, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 126 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Petersliie, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Richte, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strauss, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board member ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I’m concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lisa Triff Bell, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Berstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agrinio R. Corbaio, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cuna, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Beistle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteva, 5283 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library Commission
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 140-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1230 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arbalo Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Glyod, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55

My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew “Daddy Andy” Jones are:

Jack Bourme, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 981 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 981 Shotwell St., Housewife
Finskey Andrae, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cholm, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Doter
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showens, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachelle Cottonreider, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer

My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Cautrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Berntsen, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2315-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Height St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo
My occupation is Urban Planner

My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instilling a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrer Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beazley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 411A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetzman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Welsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California's major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shriver, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Bovice, 234 Gates Ave., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Caspar, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 10-9th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Laborer's Union
George Fogg, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessey, 1400 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waler St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Merey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Michok, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member,
Naft Women's Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 43 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer's Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

BETTY ANN McMAHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco's future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:

Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Curran, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2493-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forshind, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Honn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melaney, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lindsale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lindsale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Saprio, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Robert Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 235 Shriver St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman

My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Americ Azevedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Melba F. Croon, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Dudum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Lockley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Clear Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alanna Hartzok, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hirabayashi, 3377 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patrice Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahouri, 64 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Sorofani, 4501-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 501 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

K. F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city’s problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.

I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley “Belle Starr”

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Pauline Burks, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Lorett L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Ciree Forrest, 40 Langston St., Accountant
Paula "Raft" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCricken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WENDY NELDER
My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen’s Betch (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.
My priorities include:
— Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
— Making Muni responsive and affordable.
— Creating needed services for seniors.
— Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
— Assuring healthful drinking water.
— Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.
To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.
My votes have benefited both renters and property owners. Wendy Nelder

ROBERT SQUERI
My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It's time for a change!

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:
Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOsuna, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickerson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2717-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gulbenkay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Kochne, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Reddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricio J. Smith, 322 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OLGA TALAMANTE

My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:
Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St, Community College Instructor
Peter Goslin, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudilsburgh, 2726 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Francia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purcell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabisa, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emett Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldamando, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shrader, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

WILLIAM TOCCO

My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager, Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:
Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC
AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMNR
Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68% Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1937 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel R. Johns, 2328-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latto, 191 Los Palomos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMNR
VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur's Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgea Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Cheston Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38
John Viberg, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zanichonka, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city’s communities, leaders and constituencies.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jacks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Jim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrippino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtsclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denebloom, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President I.L.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadiish, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geyer, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 656-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., SpecialAssistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanton St., Commissioner
Joseph Frietas, Jr., 3300 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachiner, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Borcic, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor’s Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jaques, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomata N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
N. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42


San Francisco needs a new voice.

I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.

Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I’ll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff’s Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 237 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Mortimer Fleishman III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physicis
Susana Garell, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonne Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Loreh, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconi, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nordza, 408-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsey B. Nuvareste, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neport, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O’Hern, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education

My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bartits, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agrupino R. Carbone, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Perata Ave., Prof, Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers’ Assoc.
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Ladde Farfan, 1322 Funston, Chair, Comm. Advis., Comt. Special Education
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Gosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimar, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airport Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 72 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave, Assemblyman CA legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casis Ava. Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanie, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tım, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yon Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA

My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:

John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 95 Park St, Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arballo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Tareq-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mipah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkauth, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecila Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramón P. Navarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pettit, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 318-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student

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

WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:

New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:

Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimson, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Oceana Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Pacagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Rue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Nolsta St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Hornor, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barcroft, 57 Parade St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Sup't
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pillin, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-36th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tressman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Ziska, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Svrs. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF
My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 650-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agripino Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Catalino Testori Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denebne, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3001-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo F. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinar, 332 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 527-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemenovski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3723 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burl Toler, 581 Orinda, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN
My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn’t!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.
My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco’s Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women’s Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-1st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan L. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Miniter
Josephine E. Cole, 1599-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 73 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.W.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 621 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1599 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephan Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliitus, Minister

The Sponsors for George L. O'Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DaPrato, 374 Laidley, Physicin
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 907 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Rainabundo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard
President
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems
Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroul, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dosey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 621 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1355-38th Ave., Commit Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St„ Telecommunications Systems
Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT R. BACCI
My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice; I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK
My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:
Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourjart, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 25 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3530 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hunt, 340 San Benito, Executive
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.

M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association
President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salem, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terheden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vukovich, 177 Alamo Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunter's Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agripina R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1595-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Gooby, 259 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne H. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lorado Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 83 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir., ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 88 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hoc Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Memory, 3328 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Teresa A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 485 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney
CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ROBERT E. BURTON
My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.
My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:
Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Beberman, 1529 Shadder Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women's Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President I.WU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaphanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Ketum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hilton E. Smith, 345 Montecillo, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

Robert E. Burton

ROBERT A. DA PRATO
My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:
— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.
— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.
— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Lands O'Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard
President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornell, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goetzl, 130 Cliff Bay, Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goetzl, 130 Cliff Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 320 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Penne L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

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

CAROLE MIGDEN
My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34.
My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
— to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
— to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
— to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Boroice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 3022-10th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County.
Sally Brunno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 138 Granville Way, Parent
Arlipino R. Carbar, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Eliaier, 3004 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Agar Jaick, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Arinstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 351 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomatra N. Scott, 1912 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Evergreen Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 122 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Woldred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:
George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tsao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Deescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Macchialin, 1328-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kiewasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 68-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 766-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Babara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Mehl, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marlyn Sperber, 2665 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trewors, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Ganon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Deescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Lu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and twice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and later part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

The Sponsors for Sal Roselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinaro, 1232 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervision
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Deneheimer, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1400 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daily, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Sampa Lane, Legislative Director L.L.W.U.
Anne Krothenberg, 1621 Weller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Monkowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-26th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Mades O’B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoriida Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. “Jack” Webb, 100 Mocadita Way, Security Administrator
A. Ceci Williams, 60 Filligree, Minister

SAL ROSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager
My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District’s crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revitalize morale.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Gary G. Brit, 5622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1467-12th Ave., Member, Board of Supervisors
Robert E. Burton, 2172-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker’s Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary L. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Prescott Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tru Realtors
Robert DeVeirs, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolsen, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1399 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotheodore Kild, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. A. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F.
P.U.C.

Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margaretic Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Theomia Salesly, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tothman, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yoriida Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocadita, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfdorf, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alain S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

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

ALAN S. WONG
My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master’s Degree in social work. Since 1959, I’ve served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripino R. Cerbato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Vehail Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Heffessey, 1400 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hoagst, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2209-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molnar, 1522 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shinn, 19 Middelfield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 789-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaritas St., Minister Glad Church
Tempey Y. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA
boca milagro
Oficina 150 de la Academia de la Ciudad,
las elecciones. Oficina una solicitud en la
Rabaje en los lugares de votación el día de

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A

Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens’ complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators’ salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens’ complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That's just not fair for the officer or the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.’s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.’s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department’s disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer’s authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reject Moscone-Milk “killer-cop” Dan White: YES on “A” ... Defeat BART Board’s Eugene Garfinkle (whom Dan White ballot-sponsored in 1978).

— MOSCONIE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCONIE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don’t demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

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

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda "Committee for Economic Democracy" proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of "fat" APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the "POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT" are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it's efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can "dream up" more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960's that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a "cure-all", but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
**Muni Acquisitions**

**PROPOSITION B**

Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed \( \frac{3}{4} \) of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than \( \frac{3}{4} \) of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition B would remove the present limit of \( \frac{3}{4} \) of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City's ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City's ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

---

**Controller's Statement on “B”**

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “B”**

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

---

**NOTE**

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

---

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on "B" vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni's capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today's astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on "B" we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on "B" vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni's need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on "B" so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni's fleet.

VOTE YES ON "B".
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today's urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

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

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 88.
VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs . . . Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote NO!!!

Bob Geary
SART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on “D”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
John I. Molinari Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne Board of Supervisors
Richard D. Hongisto Board of Supervisors
Lee Dolson Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward Board of Supervisors
F. Walter Johnson Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.

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

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans, of one "provider" and one "dependent" in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition "E" are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote "YES" on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse's life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: "The costs cannot be accurately determined."

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said "Quote" "The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it's a new field. We have no actuarial data."

"We also do not know how many people the plan would affect."

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:
William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((($9,600)) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

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

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

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it’s the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors’ current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors’ salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco’s taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS’ SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccari
Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermosa
Wills Hannawalt

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

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors’ pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to assure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Fellhauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sozzi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Aloytia J. Smyth
Joan Willenssen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emolyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jebe
Harry Hance Stein
Albert and Mary Groth
Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Bessie Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farbstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibach
Dorothy Nisley
Caroline Binn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander
Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramus
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fonton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Curli
Rita Dallmonti
Hazel Latine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marion Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garibaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffit
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavellini
Robert Galasza
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Martel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cruzan
Walter G. Jebe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerold Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Luebello
Veronica Murray
Helen Norgnier
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Halberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Bass
Walter and Kathleen Glynn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Told
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Lorna Follett
William McGrath

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor’s salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

• The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

• Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

• People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

• A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

• Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it’s the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let’s break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually 11 x $9,600 $ 105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per month — $21,450 annually times 11 235,950

Total $ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote “NO”!!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committee)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors’ pay to 25% of the Mayor’s salary): “The City is facing a dire financial crisis... Proposition J... is the wrong idea at the wrong time.”

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61%

pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
(Republican Committee)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committee)

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

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
“Miscellaneous” Employees’ Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide “fixed” employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on “age at entry” into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on “age at entry” is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a “fixed” rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, “age at entry” rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7 1/2% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City’s rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years’ cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers’ Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

8.507 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,

(Continued on page 90)
PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

The challenge of effective law enforcement in today's society of high and rising crime rates requires competent men and women from all backgrounds and walks of life. At a cost of approximately 99 cents a month, you can help create one fair system of compensation and at the same time help the San Francisco Police Department become competitive in recruiting the finest people for the job.

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Bob Barry
President S.F. Police Officers Association
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore
Gordon Lau
Former Supervisor
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
Chuck Ayala
Director, C.Y.O.
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
John Foran
State Senator

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult cir-

cumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote "YES"!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in
Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el dia de las
elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan
personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga
una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la
Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller's Statement on "J"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:
Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot
On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.
The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.
A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay for Sworn Officers. They receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to one and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well-trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VINCE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

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

PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF “K” — SEE PAGE 99
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E's Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you're right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 "public power" cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn’t pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city's hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy's cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go "public power". And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

- Palo Alto (public): $11.06
- Redding (public): $12.35
- Santa Clara (public): $14.50

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Butler
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borvce
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lulu Carter
Manuel Coballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Connie Ford

Eulalia Frausto
Carmen Frugoni
Richard Galkowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zuretti Gooby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallinan
Sue Hector
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Allison Brennan Kwasnik
David Leaman

Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Noe Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shaskan
Stanley Shields
James Shoch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneth
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventura
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Cara Wyland

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kiechnick, Ph.D.
Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumier, CPA
J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”)

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

VOTE NO ON “K”

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we’d have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we’d be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930’s, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON “K”

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as $15 million).

*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.

*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).

*A huge new City administrative staff.

*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money, and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Straiton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kudish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”
Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinar
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)
Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote NO. If you WANT the ramps built, vote YES.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco's world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

Maurine Kollugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The "Can't use the side door" fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient "off-street" access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An obtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on "symbolism" to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, "costs be damned" career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to "butcher" the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn't enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

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

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

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls. . . a national landmark.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition “L” denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition “L” would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition “L” is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, state and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on “L” for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamante, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor’s Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Weslia Whitfield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodenow
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKean Murphy
Kathleen Lemmers, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolford, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatre Rhonoceros
Dmitri Belser
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rutberg

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

Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved—that objective: Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

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

OOPS!

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller’s Statement on “M”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:
Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

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

How Prop M Got on Ballot
On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant
Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelin Samaras, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Eses, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco's housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project's site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark                      William Sepatatis
Michael Tuggle                  David Finn
J. E. O'Guin                    Sylvia Durance
Patrick Conley                  Lyle Conley
Dorothy Campbell                Wilfred Willis
Helen O'Connell                 June Sanchez
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER
SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Cowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devon Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Steigman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chin
Guy Cherney
Ted Souls
Gene Prat
William Conway
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL: VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People

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

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bards urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed “medically oriented” use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other “ancillary commercial areas” in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote “NO” on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote “NO” on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-Ashbury Improvement Association
HAIGHT-Ashbury Neighborhood Council
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco Civic Associations
SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider’s Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area’s major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Briganie
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucic
Mile Cucic
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenton
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadja Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don’t let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park’s skyline. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committee)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

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

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions Governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall make recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefor for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

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

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ((in amount not to)) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
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shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described; (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions; (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable

useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION C

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

7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

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

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

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

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

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members’ dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons’ dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in Section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with Sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.406 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

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

8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.565-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years, and further provided that the provisions of this section shall be applicable only to the first such marriage.

Any allowance hereforetermined by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION H
(Continued from page 70)

the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” and “death benefit.”

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms “miscellaneous officer or employee,” or “member,” as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 1/4</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 1/2</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 3/4</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 1/4</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 1/2</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 3/4</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 1/4</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 1/2</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 3/4</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 1/4</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 1/2</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 3/4</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 1/4</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 1/2</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 3/4</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 1/4</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 1/2</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 3/4</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 1/4</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 1/2</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 3/4</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 1/4</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 1/2</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 3/4</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 1/4</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 1/2</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 3/4</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 1/4</td>
<td>1.9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 1/2</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 3/4</td>
<td>1.9750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
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relegation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $100 per month upon retirement after thirty years of service and after attaining the age of sixty years, and provided further that no any member within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. 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 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 entitled to an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty-five, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

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

(a) 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
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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 amount 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 reemployment board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 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 manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experienced by 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 on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(1) 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.

(4) 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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 herefore submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

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

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member's service with the City and County of San Francisco, been continuous and uninterrupted throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

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

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman, or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
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8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy (70) per cent of said member’s final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date on which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediate-

ly prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, as computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board’s own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by any member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the survivorspage through their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the 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 spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 marriage, to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
(Proposition 1, Continued)
city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit
If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit
Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service
The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:
(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.
(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.
(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged in or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds
All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.
(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, 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 to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-
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...tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be added to, or prohibited by, the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent any retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might accrue to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall have the service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 until and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by disability or injury, be it recognized by any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in the Labor Code shall, in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

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

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter; the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part I of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll calls, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said police commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half ((in the judgment of the police commission)) as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

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

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county."

the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
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a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary
for conversion of such a system from municipal own-
ership to consumer ownership; and examination of
models of governance and management for such a
public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study
should also consider the alternative of a system which
provides electricity to the residential and industrial
sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than
to that portion of the city and county within the area
commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment Dis-
"trict." In addition to examining alternatives, the con-
tractor shall make recommendations from among the
alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency
and such other criteria as may be suggested by the
Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of
Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned
in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of pas-
sage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall
authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility
study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and de-
termination of a contractor shall be made by the
Public Utilities Commission after public hearings con-
cerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out
the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of
this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall author-
ize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of
funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as
may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that
such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of
the Department, but instead be taken from revenues
normally available for funding of studies by the
Department. The contractor for such study shall be
directed to complete and present the study to the
Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10,
1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed fea-
sibility study to the city and county by the contractor,
the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of
acquisition, including condemnation of property and
bond authorization, before the people at the general
election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any rea-
son be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance
shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full
force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordi-
nance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent
the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for
above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:
It shall be the policy of the City and County of
San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the
public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general
welfare and to protect the character and stability of
the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex
and the University of California Medical Center, and
to promote the orderly and beneficial development of
such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all
other acts necessary to provide for the appropria-
t zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for
guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or
more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaur-
ant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and
other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty
housing units which can be sold at a fair market
price or rented at a fair rental market price. Fur-
thermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking
spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five
automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an
area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical com-
plex and medical center, which area is specifically de-
scribed as follows:
That certain real property situated in the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
scribed as follows:
PARCEL 1:
Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of
PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the
office of the Recorder of the City and County of
San Francisco, State of California, described as fol-

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the
southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of
said lot 45; running thence easterly along said souther-
ly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'/20" to the right and running southerly parallel with
the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of
32.664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'/34" to the right
and running westerly 35.807 feet to the westerly line of
said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'/26" to the
right and running northerly along said westerly line of
said Lot 45, a distance of 28.715 feet to the point of
beginning.

PARCEL 2:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon
"Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
scribed as a whole as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 28.715 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 30.234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'/10" to
the left and running easterly 35.808 feet; thence
deflecting 90°38'/50" to the left and running northerly
parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a dis-
tance of 30.424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'/39"
to the left and running westerly 35.807 feet to the point
of beginning.

PARCEL 3:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon
"Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
scribed as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 58.949 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence
southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 31.051 feet to the southerly line of said
Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'/20" to the left and
running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots
45 and 46, a distance of 44.798 feet; thence deflecting
84°02'/40" to the left and running northerly parallel
with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26
feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence
at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:
PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:
BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:
Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.
Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
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BART DISTRICTS
District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER’S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

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

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

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:

ENVIAME LA BALOTA A:

請將選票寄給本人下址：

DATE: ____________________________
FECHA: ____________________________

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ________________________
My residence address is ________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 28 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 28 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

MAIL TO: ABBRENT VOTING SECTION
ENVIAR A: REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
POSTAL ADDRESS: ROOM 156, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambie el ________________________ de 19 ______
Mi dirección es ________________________

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

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

2000 TYPE BALLOT

VOTER SELECTION COUPON

CUT OUT ALONG DOTTED LINES

your ballot corresponds to "YES" or "NO". This number will appear on
the case of State Judges and Propositions. Circle the number
selected with a pen or pencil. See instructions on the back of this
coupon for additional details.

1) F] Applyable: This choice may not appear on all ballot styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assembly
Speaker
Congress
U.S. Senate
Board of Education
Secretary General
Treasury
Securities of State
Supreme Court
L.A. County

CANDIDATES

Address:
San Francisco, CA 94102-6971
155 City Hall
Registrar of Voters
Jay Patterson
General Election
November 2, 1982
Sample Ballot
Page 3
# General Election
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### General Information

<table>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>18</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>20,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE BALLOT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Candidates for Judge

| Alfred G. Chiantelli   | 21   |
| Patricia (Pat) Lucey   | 21   |

### Candidates for BART Director

| Robert Barnes          | 22   |
| Bob Geary              | 22   |
| Eugene Garfinkle       | 23   |
| Robert Silvestri       | 23   |

### Candidates for Supervisor

| Sister Boom Boom       | 24   |
| Richard Bradley        | 24   |
| Diana Coleman          | 25   |
| Greg Day               | 25   |
| Jerry DeYoung          | 26   |
| Lee S. Dolson          | 26   |
| Martin Lee Eng         | 27   |
| Kenneth L. Farmer      | 27   |
| Richard Hongisto       | 28   |
| Daddy Andy Jones       | 28   |
| Ellis L.A. Keyes       | 29   |
| Julian Lagos           | 29   |
| Bill Maher             | 30   |
| Betty Ann McMahon      | 30   |
| Eric Monceur           | 31   |
| “Belle Starr” Moseley  | 31   |
| Wendy Nelder           | 32   |
| Robert Squeri          | 32   |
| Olga Talamante         | 33   |
| William Tocco          | 33   |
| Ben Tom                | 34   |
| Nancy G. Walker        | 34   |
| Doris Ward             | 35   |
| Dave Wharton           | 35   |

### Candidates for Board of Education

| Rosario Anaya          | 36   |
| Margaret Crichton DeOsuna | 36 |
| William Felzer         | 37   |
| Myra Kopf              | 37   |
| George L. O’Brien      | 38   |
| Sondia M. Wilson       | 38   |

### Propositions

#### Proposition A

Establishes a Citizen Complaint Office within the SFPD, staffed by civilians.

- Analysis: 44
- Arguments: 45-47
- Text of Proposed Law: 86, 87

#### Proposition B

Removes some of the fiscal restrictions on financing muni vehicles and related items.

- Analysis: 48
- Argument: 49
- Text of Proposed Law: 87, 88

#### Proposition C

Authorizes Supervisors to issue industrial development bonds or notes.

- Analysis: 50
- Arguments: 51
- Text of Proposed Law: 88

#### Proposition D

Extends employee health benefits to surviving spouses.

- Analysis: 52
- Argument: 53
- Text of Proposed Law: 89

#### Proposition E

Continues retirement benefits to surviving spouses who remarry after age 60.

- Analysis: 54
- Argument: 55
- Text of Proposed Law: 89

#### Proposition F

Proposition F was removed by the Board of Supervisors just before press time.

### Proposition G

Sets Board of Supervisors' salaries at $23,924 per year.

- Analysis: 56
- Arguments: 57-60
- Text of Proposed Law: 56

### Proposition H

Sets City Employee retirement contribution rate at 7½% for all "miscellaneous" employees instead of the present variable rate.

- Analysis: 61
- Argument: 62

### Proposition I

Establishes a new retirement plan for police officers.

- Analysis: 63
- Arguments: 64, 65

### Proposition J

Provides payment of time-and-a-half for police officers who work overtime.

- Analysis: 66
- Arguments: 67, 68
- Text of Proposed Law: 99

### Proposition K

Provides for a feasibility study and an election to decide on the acquisition of the electric utility.

- Analysis: 69
- Arguments: 70-74
- Text of Proposed Law: 99, 100

### Proposition L

Would declare opposition to construction of ramps to City Hall's main entrance.

- Analysis: 75
- Arguments: 76-78

### Proposition M

Would declare support for hotel complex to be built in the vicinity of U.C. Medical Center.

- Analysis: 79
- Arguments: 80-85
- Text of Proposed Declaration: 100-101

### Credits

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

The cover was designed by Opus Group, 1738 Stockton Street, San Francisco. The printer was Gazette Press, Inc.
### Governor

**Governador**

- **DAN P. DOUCHERTY**, Libertarian
  Businessman/Comerciante
  [Vote: 3 →]
- **GEORGE DUKE DEUKMEHAN**, Republican
  Attorney General of California/Fiscal General de California
  加州司法廳長
  [Vote: 4 →]
- **ELIZABETH MARTINEZ**, Peace and Freedom
  Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador
  作家，編輯，組織人
  [Vote: 5 →]
- **TOM BRADLEY**, Democratic
  Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcaldede-Los Angeles
  洛杉磯市市長
  [Vote: 6 →]
- **JAMES C. GRIFFIN**, American Independent
  Professional Trucker/Caminero
  專業貨運人員
  [Vote: 7 →]

### Lieutenant Governor

**Vicegovernador**

- **HOUSTON A. MYERS**, American Independent
  Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles
  汽車商人
  [Vote: 13 →]
- **LEO T. MC CARTHY**, Democratic
  Assemblyman, California Legislature/Asamblea, de la Legislatura de California
  州衆議員
  [Vote: 14 →]
- **JOHN R. VERNON**, Libertarian
  Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor
  餐館顧問／包辦伙食者
  [Vote: 15 →]
- **CLYDE KUHN**, Peace and Freedom
  State Party Secretary/Secretary Estatal de Partido Político
  州黨書記
  [Vote: 16 →]
- **CAROL HALLETT**, Republican
  State Legislator/Farmer/Legislador Estatal/Granjero
  州議員／農民
  [Vote: 17 →]

### Secretary of State

**Secretario de Estado**

- **ALFRED W. SMITH**, American Independent
  Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias
  實業經紀
  [Vote: 22 →]
- **GORDON DUFFY**, Republican
  California State Legislator/Legislator del Estado de California
  加州議員
  [Vote: 23 →]
- **MILTON SHIRO TAKEI**, Peace and Freedom
  Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén
  貨倉工人
  [Vote: 24 →]
- **MARTIN E. BUERGER**, Libertarian
  Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio
  商業顧問
  [Vote: 25 →]
- **MARCH FONG EU**, Democratic
  Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaría de Estado, Estado de California
  州務卿
  [Vote: 26 →]
Controller  CONTRALOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Concejal de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
<td>柏克莱市市参议员</td>
<td>27 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>律师</td>
<td>28 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY, Democratic</td>
<td>California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California</td>
<td>加州审计官</td>
<td>29 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY GINGELL, Libertarian</td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
<td>運輸服務經理</td>
<td>30 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM, American Independent</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>女商人</td>
<td>31 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treasurer  TESORERO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td>審定公共会计师</td>
<td>35 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrer de Obr</td>
<td>鋼鐵工人</td>
<td>36 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>企業財務人員</td>
<td>37 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td>州司库</td>
<td>38 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent</td>
<td>Analyst/Analista</td>
<td>分析员</td>
<td>39 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attorney General  PROCURADOR GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles</td>
<td>洛杉矶县地方检察官</td>
<td>42 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMOWE (BART) LEE, Libertarian</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td>民事自由律师</td>
<td>43 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral</td>
<td>勞工律师</td>
<td>44 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General</td>
<td>资深副总检察官</td>
<td>45 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member, State Board of Equalization—1st District  Miembro, Consejo Estatal de Igualeamiento — Distrito #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote for Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/PropONENTE DE LA REFORMA DE IMPUESTOS</td>
<td>税改改革倡議人</td>
<td>49 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>State Board of Equalization, Assistant Member, Dist. 1/Departamento de Igualeamiento, Miembro auxiliar, Distrito 1</td>
<td>州平等局第1区参议员</td>
<td>50 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NYCREN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/ANTI-TAX ADVOCATE/COMERCIANTE/PROONENTE CONTRA LOS IMPUESTOS</td>
<td>商人／反税改倡議人</td>
<td>51 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. “BILL” IVERS, Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legislator del Estado de California</td>
<td>加州立法院议员</td>
<td>52 ▶️</td>
<td>▶️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>Printer/Impresor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVID WALD</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETE WILSON, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democrat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor of California/Gobernador de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in Congress—6th District</td>
<td>BARBARA BOXER, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>County Supervisor/Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOWARD C. CREIGHTON, Libertarian</td>
<td>Mortgage Banker/Banquero Hipotecario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIMOTHY-ALLEN ALBERTSON, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Law Clerk/Clergyman/Empleado de Oficina Juriocida/Clerigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENNIS MCQUAID, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senator—8th Senatorial District</td>
<td>MICHAEL E. MAYAKIS, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Community Switchboard President/Presidente de Tablero de Comunidades de la Comunidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN F. FORAN, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Senator/Senador Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEANNE C. GUTH, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administrator/Administrador de Comercio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District</td>
<td>ART AGNOS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Assemblyman/Asambleista Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GORDON A. BLOYER, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Consultant/Consultor de Gerente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK K. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN E. BROUSSARD</td>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ REYNOSO</td>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH H. GRODIN</td>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1

**Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8

**Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BARNES</td>
<td>Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKLE</td>
<td>BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Anti-Seuer Tax Chairman/Jefe Contra Impuestos de Alcantarillado</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
### Superintendent of Public Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Riles</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Públíca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sodonia M. Wilson</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario Anaya</td>
<td>President San Francisco Board of Education/President, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Felzer</td>
<td>Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. O'Brien</td>
<td>Free Schooler - Economists, Instructor/Escolar Libre - Instructor de Economía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Crichton de Osuna</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Kopf</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan S. Wong</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Rosselli</td>
<td>Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Riordan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Bacci</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael S. Bernick</td>
<td>Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Prato</td>
<td>Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland Moglen</td>
<td>Hospital Administration, MS, J.D. / Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY J. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUERI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NEILDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. &quot;BELLE STARR&quot; MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raices, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Acquisitions Bond Act. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $55,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>First-Time Home Buyers Bond Act of 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Pension Fund Investment. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td>Proponentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>186 A Favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>190 A Favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>194 A Favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>198 A Favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>202 A Favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>206 SI A Favor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medidas Sometidas Al Voto De Los Votantes**

**Proposiciones Estatales**

1. **Estatuto de Bonos de Compra-Ahorrando para la Construcción de Escuelas de 1982.** Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolsos de capital para la construcción o mejoría de escuelas públicas.

2. **Acta de Bonos de Desembolso de Capital para Carcel de Conrado de 1981.** Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y repuesto de cárcel de Conrado y la provisión de mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.

3. **Acta de Bonos de Veteranos de 1982.** Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.

4. **Acta de Bonos de Adquisiciones de Lake Tahoe.** Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Granja de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar las vidas pínturas y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es $85,000,000.

5. **Acta de Bonos de Compradores de Casas por Primera Vez de 1982.** Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.

6. **Inversión de Fondos de Pensions Públicos.** Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos prescritos de acciones comunes. Prescribir normas de inversión fiduciarias. Impacto fiscal: De ponerse en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañadas por riesgo mayor para los fondos participantes, lo cual podría aminorar pérdidas capitales para los fondos.

**Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco**

**ELECCIÓN GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982**

**Medidas Sometidas Al Voto De Los Votantes**

**Proposiciones Estatales**

1. **1982年州校舍租－購公債法案。**
   这个法案规定发行公債 5 亿元（$500,000,000），作为興建或改善公共學校的資金。

2. **1981年监狱基建费公債法案。**
   这个法案规定发行公債 2 億 8 千萬元（$280,000,000），用作興建、重建、改建和更换监狱，以及推遲維修等用途。

3. **1982年退役人员公債法案。**
   这个法案规定发行公債 4 億 5 千萬元（$450,000,000），用作资助加州退役人员购置農場與房屋。

4. **購買太浩湖公債法案。**
   这个法案规定发行公債 8 千 5 百萬元（$85,000,000），用作維護太浩湖盆地實業，以防止這獨特的自然資源環境的衰落，保護太浩湖的水土不致退化，保護太浩湖的風景和娛樂的價值。

5. **1982年第一次買屋者公債法案。**
   这个法案规定发行公債 2 億 6 千萬元（$200,000,000），用作资助買屋。

6. **公共養老金投資。** 准予州議會批准在特定普通股票投資更大的比例，制定受益投資的標準。財政影響：一旦付諸實施，可能會因利息和資本的增值而增加收益的機會，但風險亦大，以致用作投資的公共養老金和退休金可能要承擔資金的範圍。
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

7

YES 211 →
NO 212 →

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

8

YES 215 →
NO 216 →

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact, until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

9

YES 220 →
NO 221 →

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

10

YES 225 →
NO 226 →

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

11

YES 229 →
NO 230 →

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

12

YES 233 →
NO 234 →
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
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TASACION, VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la propietaria la exención de impuestos por razón de su nueva construcción. Impacto fiscal: Ninguno. Impacto sobre su instrumentación: Aumento en los costos de adquisición.

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambia las bases de fuentes y provee de fondos a ciudades y comunidades. Impacto fiscal: Ninguno. Impacto sobre su instrumentación: Aumento en los costos de mantenimiento.

REFERENCES ESCOLARES, ESCUELAS NO PÚBLICAS. Autoriza la provisión de libros a estudiantes de escuelas no públicas bajo condiciones similares.

UNIFICACIÓN DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La legislatura puede unificar las costas de los procesos.

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada día tenga un límite por individuo.

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el gobernador escriba un informe sobre el uso de armas nucleares.

Municipal  
211 SI  7  
Municipal  
212 NO  

Municipal  
215 SI  8  
Municipal  
216 NO  

Municipal  
220 SI  9  
Municipal  
221 NO  

Municipal  
225 SI  10  
Municipal  
226 NO  

Municipal  
229 SI  11  
Municipal  
230 NO  

Municipal  
233 SI  12  
Municipal  
234 NO  

(Texto en español, incluyendo referencias a temas como tasaciones, transferencias temporales de fondos, references escolares, unificación de tribunales, recipientes de bebidas, armas nucleares, etc.)
WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

13 YES 237 →
NO 238 →

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $125,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

14 YES 241 →
NO 242 →

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

15 YES 245 →
NO 246 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249 →
NO 250 →

B Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 3/4 of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

C Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256 →
NO 257 →

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

YES 259 →
NO 260 →
CUIDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
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RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación estrictos para aguas propias, permite asignaciones para aguas subterráneas, usos del río Stanislaus y reglamentación de consumo excesivo de agua. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1.48 mil millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hídricos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de litigación; pérdida desconocida de ríos de orillas eléctricas y alturas desconocidas de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla sectores que intervienen.


ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidos. Prohíbe el porte de armas de fuego y de francotirador. Impacto fiscal: Impacto imposible de determinar. Aumentaría los costos administrativos reemplazando costos conocidos por costos desconocidos. Impacto desconocido del costo de mantenimiento del sistema de justicia criminal. Podría afectar los costos de impuestos a la venta y la renta. Ver el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los variables.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

244 SI Comision
245 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

246 SI Comision
247 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

248 SI Comision
249 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

250 SI Comision
251 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

252 SI Comision
253 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

254 SI Comision
255 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

256 SI Comision
257 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

258 SI Comision
259 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

260 SI Comision
261 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

262 SI Comision
263 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

264 SI Comision
265 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

266 SI Comision
267 NO Rechazo

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>PROPOSITION F HAS BEEN REMOVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Folk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
La Junta de Supervisores ha eliminado la proposición F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Pregunta Opción</th>
<th>Texto en español</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al caerse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>退休制度内的成员的同住配偶，目前可享受受到借款。如果他們在 60 岁後再婚，應否繼續享受這種借款?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Dará pagaría a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>每一市參議員應否發給年薪 $23,924 元?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados municipales de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse el 7.5% de la compensación de estos empleados?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>市務員工對退休制度的捐費額，應否定為其薪酬的 7.5 %?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1 de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>警察局在 1982 年 11 月 1 日之後雇用的穿制服警員，應否設立新的退休計劃和殘障保 險計劃？現任警員亦有權從現有的計劃轉移到 新的計劃?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagar sueldo a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberá descontar tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajar en días feriados, según lo solicite el oficial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>警員加班或在假日執行職務，應否每小時 發給一時半的薪酬或對其要求每日補回一日子 休時間?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos de San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completar el estudio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>市參議會應否訂出各種步驟和目標。調查 研究關於把舊金山電力收歸公有的可能性，並 在調查研究完成之後，再取得該公用事業提交 選民在選舉中付諸表決?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificándole la propiedad para su ubicación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>市政府大廈在橫街及關街的入口處不修建 通路是否應由舊金山市、縣政府的政策?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI/Contra</td>
<td>¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificándole la propiedad para su ubicación?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO/Contra</td>
<td>為了批准在巴納納斯崗醫院綜合大樓和加 州大學醫藥中心地區興建一座私營酒店，分區 條例應作修改，並聲明該產業的所在地，這是否應由舊金山市、縣政府的政策?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

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

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

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

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3).

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

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
- mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters’ handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

**BONDS OR NOTES** — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

**BUDGET** — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

**CAPITAL COSTS** — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

**MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES** — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**POLLED PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

---

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney
My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscoan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olicomendy, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE
PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lacey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian
My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42
My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator
My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR

EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR

ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:
— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: "The people don't care."
— "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police "decoy" operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who's Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

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

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glasser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antiquis Dealer
Christiann H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spanner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffitt St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1795 McAllister, Clerk

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32

Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Costak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Dana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carlo M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikemtimi, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1386 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alon R. Thesen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Wele, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

**Ernest C. Ayala**, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
**Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors**
**Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer, Planning Commissioner**
**Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Br.**
**Edward F. Cailanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner**
**Mary L. Cailanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco**
**Preston Cook, 3311 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors**
**Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer**
**Lee S. Dobson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher**
**Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director**
**Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer**
**James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU**
**Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner**
**Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney**
**Fotsohore Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney**
**Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors**

John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive

**Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.**

Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelly, 70 Everon St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sutton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Toberner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

**John J. Webb**, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
**Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member**
**Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker**

Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

**Art Agnos**, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
**Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors**

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denzheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1409 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boscheto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobtetz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Bealsie Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director

Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.

Anne Krohtenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst

Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director

William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired

Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner

Connie O’Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)

Sandra A. Ouyse, 827-24th Ave., Administrator

Fr. Miles O’R. Riley, 3221-16th St., Catholic Priest

Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer

Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official

Dorothy Vukich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator

Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

**John J. "Jack" Webb**, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator

A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister
DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Supporter Spartacist, labor/socialists who organized stopping Nazi celebration of Hitler's birthday, San Francisco 1980. Union militant, six years CWA. Member National Association Letter Carriers. Break with — build a workers' party! Strike action to bring down Reagan! No gun control — labor/black defense against Klan/Nazi terror! For massive public works under union control! Jobs for all, decent housing, free medical care, childcare, education, transit! Full equality — minorities, women, homosexuals! Citizenship rights for undocumented workers! From Afghanistan to Poland to El Salvador — down with Reagan's anti-Soviet war drive! Throw out the capitalists! Seize banks, industry — no compensation! Establish workers' government

Diana Coleman

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jaqueylene E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Iregami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-44th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Sereno Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

GREG DAY
My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist
My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality... safer neighborhoods... stronger rent control... affordable housing... control downtown growth... employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:
Tom Ammann, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Consore, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillies, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Delon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Munnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3543-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romaine St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stullings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steinre St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JERRY R. De YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Haiden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilacion, 88 Waterville St., Distribution Att’ld Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pl., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 113A Duboce St., Legal Asst/Sr. Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stambensky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Sumner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond I. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coonrad, 631 Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim F. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samarzes, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:
Ted Aksnes, 1882 Green St, Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beechworth, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 123 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-20th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Peterson, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strauss, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbyn Tom, 29 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER
My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Belleveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jarett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobb, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irina Crenshaw, 529 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry E. Elliot, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitsch, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoenaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trouco, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Barlett St., Houstman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lin Teff Belli, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Berstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvice, 224 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belsie Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director, Victim Witness

Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jesse T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women

Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library Commission

Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1671-11th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors

Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Oyue, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Ficcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Floyd, 555 Norway, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55
My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew “Daddy Andy” Jones are:

Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinsky Andreu, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmoniela L. Dela Cruz, 2765 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohrn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Interviewee
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Deiter
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 557 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rhachelle Cotooner, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Alby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer

My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-223rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Caudetelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Bernsten, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Heffler, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-2th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo
My occupation is Urban Planner

My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, a $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrue A. Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beazley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 5240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Gremet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kaiman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 411A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahen, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Mesas, 2117 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilskey, 417 Stockton, Messenger
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BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California’s major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

BETTY ANN McMATHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco’s future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Currivan, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Folsom, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Henn, 2222 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melanophon, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St, Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapito, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Roberta Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shnader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 169 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Berman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 2622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evanovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Laborer’s Union
George Fous, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Walker St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member,
Na’iL Women’s Political Caucus
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O’Keeffe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer’s Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yuri Wanda, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
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ERIC MONCUR
My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 375-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Ameeze Azevedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 15 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Melanie F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Geottinger, Photographer
Shufri R. Duddum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Locksley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 35 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alana Hartzok, 269 Cheney, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hiraibayashi, 3577 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorraine K. Imagaki, 3319 Clay St. Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahouri, 68 Alston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrofani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhem, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George R. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY
My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Francisco. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.
I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burks, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatiola, 1436 Waler St., Musician
Loretta D. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salmonperson
Lynn Ciret Forrest, 40 Langston St., Accountant
Paula "Rafi" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen’s Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.
My priorities include:
— Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
— Making Muni responsive and affordable.
— Creating needed services for seniors.
— Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
— Assuring healthful drinking water.
— Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.
To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.
My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Jean-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Ellis St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lefty” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women’s Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Sar.
Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lena, 3033 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUIER

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It’s time for a change!

The Sponsors for Robert Squier are:

Alfred D. Bacce, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret D. DeOsinia, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gilbengay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montevec Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Keehne, 2675-43rd Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McCaíistor St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squier, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squier, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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OLGA TALAMANTE
My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:
Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Gosef, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudiburch, 2726 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franconia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malti, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malti, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martini, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 229A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purrell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabias, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emme Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Salamanca, 1563 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Thomas Yrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

WILLIAM TOCCO
My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:
Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Evel H. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elise, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 688 Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanagh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latto, 191 Los Palos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur's Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neill, 145 Guerero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union Local 38
John Viberg, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters Local 860

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56

My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city’s communities, leaders and constituents.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Ducu, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Aga Jaicki, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Jim F. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrippino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Rev. Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denepen, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President LL.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Del Mar, Airport Commissioners
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 432 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Duk, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 650-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 25 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezez, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Berman, 1322 Shadr, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Broshera, 107-10th Ave., Firefighter
Jim Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Sanyan St., Commissioner
Joseph Frietas, Jr., 3360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magnell Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2060 O’Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonald, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachner, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennesi, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Theila Shelly, 564-4th Ave., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Bovince, 234 Gates, Attorney
Ames C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jens T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hgts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Horne, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jacks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Essexa Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomata N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-46th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42


San Francisco needs a new voice.

I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.

Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:

John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St, Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Moratorium Fleischaker Ill, 13 Bridgewater Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garell, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonne Green, 739-25th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guererro St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconi, 332 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morton, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Norden, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsey B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neiporot, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Herrn, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Slupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA
My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lusille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Brit, 3625-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Cerbuto, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Jandar Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteve, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L., Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimardes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2263-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 130 Castitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanie, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 Stutes, Executive Dir.
Yori Wadu, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 92 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arbol Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taq-El-Din, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hainpratty, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkurt, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Moose, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottanaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottanaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon P. Navarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richardson Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pollitt, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Curr, 319-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:
New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.
Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students’ and teachers’ programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.
Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Ross Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2925-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Oliver Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Baroco, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dung, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Sup't.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pallas, 2201-35th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-39th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stucke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tessman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Ziska, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1459-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF
My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, FTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Brittw, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agrinino Cebulas, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Teshidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent.
Ruth Asawa Laniier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Merzey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 821-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemirovski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd Ave., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burl Toler, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 563-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O’BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn’t!

Vote for George O’Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O’Brien

The Sponsors for George L. O’Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DaPrato, 374 Ladley, Physician
Mark R.icksen, 446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Rainondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakiss, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Kathleen O’Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Connet, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroul, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dorsev, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Muller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Damen Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco’s Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women’s Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Slot Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 442-5th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers’ Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Borman, 1529 Shaver, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Ministar
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 976 Guerrero St., State Gov’t. Employee
Alleen C. Hernandez, 804-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Sampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
June McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-4th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 135-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 185 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliutius, Minister
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ROBERT R. BACCI
My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly quality its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK
My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:
1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).
2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.
3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:
Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgarg, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Walter G. Jee, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.S., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.

M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association
President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terheyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Yausch, 177 San Ateo Way, Fundraiser
Margaret E. Warren, 1766-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Wisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Rd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5225 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Licardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 78-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3082 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Plivnick, 2200 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothman, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1544-38th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 490-28th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrubader Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business
and Civic Women’s Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3165 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican
American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 132 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolsen, 722 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors,
Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President HLCU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco
County
Agar Jaacks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Korrut, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinari, 1222 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors

Sandora A. Ouyne, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Roedean, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everst Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O’Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Rainondo, 1060 Fine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard
President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems
Coordinator
Kathleen O’Shea, 3346-21st Ave., Registered Nurse
Judith Goetzl, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goetzl, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwarz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems
Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballet Access Consultant
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Gailn, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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CAROLE MIGDEN

My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
- to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
- to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
- to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 362-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Brunno, 1100 E. Eagan Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 499 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denehein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
San Duen, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Eliasen, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennissey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Agar Jaiaks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Arnsen Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-30th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1539 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomata N. Scott, 1915 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 225 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wofford, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLIN,

M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:

George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr, Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tasho, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Paton Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Sennio Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Madschian, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kiehnweber, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kair, 766-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Babara A. Froster, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjol, 314 Kearny, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1600 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cador, 1367-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilyn Sperber, 2663 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevors, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gamon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 670 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

The Sponsors for Sal Roselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobletta, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daly, 759 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Lercy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Walker St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Oswe, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Mae O'B. Riley, 3221-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukovich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yorita Wada, 560-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Fillritis, Minister

SAL ROSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Roselli

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2777-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351I-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portol Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut, International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotheodore Kidd, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thefna Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tung, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Moncada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ALAN S. WONG
My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrac, Planning Commission
Philip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripina R. Cerbato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Vehalf Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John M. Heitner, 1600 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 830 - 47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Kopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Wille B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 1565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltitat St., Minister, Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER: Work at the polls on election day. Apply now in Room 155 City Hall.

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”
On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens’ complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators’ salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens’ complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court-ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That’s just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer's authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote Yes on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

DON'T DEMORALIZE POLICEMEN!!! VOTE NO.

Robert Silvestri

— BART Candidate
— Republican Committeeman
— David Sigal

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda "Committee for Economic Democracy" proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of "fat" APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the "POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT" are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it's efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can "dream up" more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960's that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a "cure-all", but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Únicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Caile Grove.
Industrial Development Financing

PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller's Statement on “C”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs... Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote "YES" on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!

Bob Gary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlen Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

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

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

---

**Controller's Statement on “D”**

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

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

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “D”**

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

- **YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.
- **NO:** Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

---

**NOTE**

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco
Endorsed by:
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Richard D. Hingst
Lee Dolson
Wendy Nelder
Carol Ruth Silver
Harry G. Britt
Nancy G. Walker
Willie B. Kennedy
Doris M. Ward
T. Walter Johnson

Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on “E”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one "provider" and one "dependent" in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition "E" are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote "YES" on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse’s life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: "The costs cannot be accurately determined."

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said "Quote: "The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it’s a new field. We have no actuarial data."

"We also do not know how many people the plan would affect."

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:

William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ($9,600) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr., President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it’s the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors' current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2,400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4,800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9,600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9,600 to a mere $3,958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors' salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $27,750 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco's taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS' SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
San Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scandlen
James Stark
William Murray
Emmett Condon
Alejandro Baccari
Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermosa
Willis Hannawalt
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Fiehler
Camille F. Reed
James V. Akern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sossi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Aloysia J. Smyth
Joan Willemson
Raymond and Clare White
Reed and Emelyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jabe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Groth

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Bessie Floherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Forstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mbach
Dorothy Nixley
Caroline Binn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramos
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Caris
Rita Dallimonti
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garibaldi
Helene Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Maffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Paych
Ann Gary
Cheryl Martel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cruzan
Walter G. Bebe
Miriam Steinbeek
Gerold Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Lubello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongier
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathryn Glynn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Risicci
Loma Follett
William McGrath

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor’s salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

• The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

• Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

• People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

• A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

• Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compound the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it’s the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let’s break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually 11 x $9,600 $ 105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per month — $21,450 annually times 11 235,950

Total $ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote “NO”!!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors’ pay to 25% of the Mayor’s salary): “The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time.”

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
(Republican Committeeman)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)
"Miscellaneous" Employees’ Retirement

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City’s Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee’s contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City’s Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”
On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide "Fixed" employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on "age at entry" into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on "age at entry" is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a "fixed" rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, "age at entry" rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City's rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years' cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers' Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three fourths vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,
Police Retirement

PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.

How Prop I Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. I.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependent) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circumstanes. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in
Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller's Statement on "J"

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
6th District
Chuck Ayala
Director C.Y.O.
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
5th Congressional District

John Foran
State Senator
6th District
Jo Daly
San Francisco Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Assembly
Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris M. Ward
Supervisor
C/C San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeeman)

Democratic Committeeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED
PROPOSITION K
Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition to this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF “K” — SEE PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E's Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you're right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 "public power" cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn't pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city's hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy's cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go "public power". And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER

Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Sacramento (public) $15.00
San Francisco (PG&E) $34.28

Vote YES on K.

CONSUMER ACTION

Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Baker
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borski
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lula Carter
Manuel Calabos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Conny Ford

Eulalia Franso
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Galowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zuretti Goody
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallman
Sue Haster
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Alton Brennan Kwasnik
David Looman

Thomas McCarthy
Leonea Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shankman
Stanley Shields
James Shoch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ira Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventura
Supervisor Nancy Walker

W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caron Wyland

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

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist
Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neillands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggeleen, CPA

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "K"

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON "K"

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called "municipalization" of P.G. & E.'s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on "municipalization" and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we'd have to pay interest on bonds at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we'd be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can't. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930's, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON "K"

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That's why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city's utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It's a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish. Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245
Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as $15 million).
*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).
*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.
*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).
*A huge new City administrative staff.
*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)

Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote “Yes” on Proposition “L”. Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote “Yes” on “L”.

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers’ money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco’s world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer’s dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The “Can’t use the side door” fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an asymmetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113’ uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient “off-street” access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EX-TRA TAX DOLLARS on “symbolism” to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, “costs be damned” career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to “butcher” the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn’t enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

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

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

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls... A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition “L” denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition “L” would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition “L” is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on “L” for Equal Access!

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamante, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor's Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Wesla Whitfield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Starfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanagh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodell
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodotnia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKee
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolfed, Community College Board
Arthur Morris; Theatre Rhinoceros
Dmitir Beiber
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinar
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rubberg

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

Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

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

OOPS!

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities.

Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant
Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees # 1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samarzes, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Ester, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco’s housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project’s site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O’Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O’Connell
William Sepanitis
David Finn
Sylvia Durance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER
SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Baten, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Bead, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devron Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lortimer, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco’s taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

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

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

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M,
THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND
LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a
city of new ideas. A city where innovation and crea-
tivity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans
are being asked to consider the exciting new designs
for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging
facility to be located adjacent to the University of
California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly
reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients
who are being treated at the University of California
Medical Center to be treated as an outpatient or dis-
charged earlier and housed in this medically oriented
lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging
for the relatives of patients who want to be close to
their loved ones during their time of need, rather
than having to commute from a location many miles
away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting
and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San
Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge
will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical
Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built
will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the in-
creased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous
jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high
are all good reasons in and of themselves to support
this project, not to mention the additional considera-
tion of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this in-
novation to improve and economize health care
delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to
lead the rest of the country by approving the comple-
tion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Souls
Gene Prat
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS
THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:
VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest
neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and
upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people,
and in close proximity to the proposed Medically
Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project.
The merits of this project are numerous. This project
is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It
will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients
which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care-
costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical
lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test
results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of
which I have personally witnessed, could be min-
imized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion
will be reduced because of the added parking and
elimination of the current to and fro transportation of
these people who are currently staying in high priced
hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and con-
structed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax
base and provide much needed jobs for residents of
the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully
designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting,
as an excellent buffer between the residential houses
and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C.
garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School,
all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in sup-
porting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes
on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bards Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Bards
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIous TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed "medically oriented" use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other "ancillary commercial areas" in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote "NO" on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote "NO" on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

San Francisco Civic Associations

SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBoce TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgments of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider’s Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area’s major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Mae Cucek
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadja Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill

Ellen Huppert
Peter Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lalanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Matthew LaVail
Margaret Northcott
Kenny O’Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salan
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don’t let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park’s skyline. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints and such clerks and employees as shall be necessary and appointed pursuant to the provisions of this chapter, and shall be under the management of a police commission consisting of five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners, holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

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

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles.

Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ([(in amount not to)]) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
(Proposition C, Continued)

shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz.: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described; (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions; (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)

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

7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

Any allowance hereforeterminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION H
(Continued from page 70)

the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6700</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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued)

revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $100 per month. 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 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, commence as provided in subsection (G) hereof, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and eight-tenths percent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in subsection (A) hereof for each year of credited service, if such retirement allowance exceeds forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

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

(a) 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 be 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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) 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 entitled him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 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 rate 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
(Proposition H, Continued)

...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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(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), (E), (F) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 propositions hereof submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

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

"Compensation earned" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member ty Act of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earned" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

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

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees’ Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of this charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two services next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediate-

ly prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-1, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least 20 years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation earnable by said member at the date of death, or until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 marriage, to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on January 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers’ compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement, from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:

1. Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

2. Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

3. Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

1. There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made by a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½%) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

2. The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, 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 to or on behalf of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-
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tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.566, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might accrue to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.590-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspensive of the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year.
A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time
during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided,
however, that contributions for the retirement system
shall be deducted from payments of such disability
benefits paid to him. The city and county shall con-
tribute, in addition to its other contributions provided
herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said
benefits in the same manner as it would contribute
on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in
this section shall mean the members in the police
department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.
(b) The basic week of service for each member
shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set
forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based
upon said basic week of service.
(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two
days off during each week, except as hereinafter
provided.
(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of
duty public interest or necessity requires the services
of any member to serve in excess of the basic week
of service during any week, the chief of police may
permit said service, and said member shall be com-
penated therefor or shall receive equivalent time
credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this
sub-section. For service performed in excess of the
basic week, member shall, as requested by the
member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight
time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio
which said excess service bears to the basic week of
service and the annual compensation provided therefor
in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off
duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.
(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be
deemed to interfere with a vacation as provided for
in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days
off per week; provided, however, that when in the
judgment of the chief of police public interest or
necessity requires the services of any member to serve
on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off,
and he shall receive additional compensation for the
period so served. Said additional compensation shall
be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and
one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra
service performed bears to the basic week of service
and the annual compensation provided therefor in
Section 3.531.
(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in
any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the
San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of
the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and
disability leaves for members are concerned.
(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police com-
mission the efficient performance of police duty
requires that one or more members of the police
department should report for roll call, orders, and
assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commis-
sion 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 compen-
sated for in money or in time off with pay.
(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the
foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police
department shall be entitled to the days declared to
be holidays for employees whose compensations are
fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compen-
sations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant
to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as
additional days off with pay. Members shall be com-
penated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and
one-half as herein computed or shall be granted
equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time
and one-half ((in the judgment of the police commis-
sion) as requested by the member.
(i) The provisions of this section changing com-
pensation for service in excess of the basic week of
service from straight time compensation and equivalent
time off duty with pay to time and one-half for com-
pensation and for time off duty with pay shall be
effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

Be it ordained by the People of the City and
County of San Francisco:
That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates
for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance
of the stated policy of the City and County of San
Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599,
which states:
"It is the declared purpose and intention of
the people of the city and county, when pub-
lic interest and necessity demand, that public
utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately
owned by the city and county."
the following steps be taken in order to bring about
public ownership of the electric utility in San Francis-
co:
1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordi-
ance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on
the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of
public ownership of the electric utility in San Francis-
co; which hearings are to include public testimony
and to be conducted at times of day conducive to
the widest possible public participation. The scope of such
feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to:
determination of the cost of acquisition of such elec-
tric facilities as may be necessary for adequate pro-
vision of electric utility service within the city and
county; determination of the potential revenue to a
municipally owned system providing such services; de-
termination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
99
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a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment District." In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY PROPOSITION M**

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to protect the character and stability of the area of the Parkside Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:

That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

**PARCEL 1:**

Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of said lot 45; running thence easterly along said southerly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 32,664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right 100 and running westerly 35.807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point of beginning.

**PARCEL 2:**

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,254 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35,808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the point of beginning.

**PARCEL 3:**

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2,95 feet; thence
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at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:

PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:

Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE
缺席選票申請表

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTER DE IMPRINTA
Application MUST also be signed below by applicant. 
正楷著者姓名
Signature will be compared with official file in this office.

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

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIÉME LA BALOTA A:
請將選票寄給本人下址：

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
申請人簽名

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco
申請人在舊金山登記選舉之住址

6. ☐ I prefer election materials in English
☐ Prefiero materiales electorales en español

☐ 我欲索取中文選舉資料
如果你已遷居

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

MAIL TO:
ENVIAR A:
POSTAL ADDRESS:
ROOM 156, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, October 25
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBERSE EN LA OFICINA 
DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS CINCO EN PUNTO 

EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA 
ELECCIÓN.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

REGISTRAR'S USE ONLY
SÓLO PARA USO DEL REGISTRADOR

Prec. No. 
Pol. Affi. n/a
Ballot No. 
Ballot Mailed 
Ballot Returned 
Alt. Record 
Inspector's Notice

Date 
Deputy Registrar
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### Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEIJAN, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney General of California/Fiscal General de California</td>
<td>香港司法廳長</td>
<td>3 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH MARTINEZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador</td>
<td>作家、編輯、組織人</td>
<td>4 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor-Los Angeles/Akule-Los Angeles</td>
<td>洛杉磯市市長</td>
<td>5 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Professional Trucker/Camionero</td>
<td>專業貨運人員</td>
<td>6 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN F. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Comerciante</td>
<td>商人</td>
<td>7 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MC CATHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature/Asembleista, de la Legislatura de California</td>
<td>省眾議員</td>
<td>13 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian</td>
<td>Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor</td>
<td>餐館顧問／包辦伙食者</td>
<td>14 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE RUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Politico</td>
<td>省黨書記</td>
<td>15 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL HALETT, Republican</td>
<td>State Legislator/Farmer/Legislator Estatal/Granjero</td>
<td>省議員／農民</td>
<td>16 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent</td>
<td>Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles</td>
<td>汽車商人</td>
<td>17 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GORDON DUFFY, Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legislar del Estado de California</td>
<td>加州議員</td>
<td>22 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON SHIRO TAKAI, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén</td>
<td>貨倉工人</td>
<td>23 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio</td>
<td>商業顧問</td>
<td>24 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td>州務卿</td>
<td>25 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
<td>實業經紀</td>
<td>26 →</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate Name</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>James L. Flournoy, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth Cory, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>California State Controller/Controlador del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Gingell, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Pat&quot; Graham, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante, 女商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florence Mc Donald, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Kevin Akin, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Steelworker/Herero de Obra, 鋼鐵工人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donald J. French, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo, 企業財務人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jesse M. Unruh, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal, 州司庫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert G. Charlton, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyst/Analista, 分析員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Antman, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Publico Letrado, 審定公共會計師</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>Bartholomew (Bart) Lee, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil, 民事自由律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Siegel, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral, 勞工律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Nicholson, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General, 資深副司法人長</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Van De Kamp, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles, 洛杉磯郡地方檢察官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization — 1st District</td>
<td>Conway H. Collins, Democratic</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>State Board of Equalizers, 委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne R. Nygren, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/PropONENTE CONTRA LOS IMPUESTOS, 商人／反稅收倡議人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William H. &quot;Bill&quot; Ivers, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator/Legislator del Estado de California, 加州立法人員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Paul Kangas, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/PropONENTE DE LA REFORMA DE IMPUESTOS, 稅收改革倡議人</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</th>
<th>Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANK K. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 79</td>
<td>YES/NO 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTO M. KAUS</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 82</td>
<td>YES/NO 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN E. BROUSSARD</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 85</td>
<td>YES/NO 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ REYNOSO</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 88</td>
<td>YES/NO 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 91</td>
<td>YES/NO 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 94</td>
<td>YES/NO 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 97</td>
<td>YES/NO 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>Yes/No 100</td>
<td>YES/NO 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CLINTON WAYNE WHITE   | For elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | 103 → YES/NO |YES/NO 104
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1</th>
<th>Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROBERT SHAVESTRI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
<td>Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transportes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALFRED G. CHANTELLI</strong></td>
<td><strong>ROBERT BARNES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</td>
<td>Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>EUGENE GARFINKLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vote por Uno</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pati選一名</strong></td>
<td><strong>Robert選一名</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert選一名</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert選一名</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugene選一名</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugene選一名</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob選一名</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob選一名</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year. To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
### Member, Board of Education

**Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco**

| Name                  | Title                                    | Education
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|------------|
| WILLIAM FELZER        | Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería | 教育工程师 139  
| GEORGE L. O'BRIEN     | Free Schooler - Economics Instructor/Instructor de Economía | 自由教育者—经济学教授 140  
| MARGARET CRIGHTON DeOSUNA | Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces | 實業經紀 141  
| MYRA KOPF             | Incumbent/En el Cargo | 現任教育局委員 142  
| SODONIA M. WILSON     | Incumbent/En el Cargo | 現任教育局委員 143  
| ROSARIO ANAYA         | President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco | 舊金山教育局主席 144  

### Member, Community College Board

**Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad de San Francisco**

| Name                  | Title                                    | Education
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------|------------|
| ROBERT E. BURTON      | Incumbent/En el Cargo | 現任社區大學校董 148  
| ROBERT R. BACCI       | Lawyer/Abogado | 律師 149  
| MICHAEL S. BERNick    | Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia | 教授／機構主任 150  
| ROBERT A. Da PRATO    | Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador | 醫生／教育家 151  
| LELAND MOGEN          | Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D. | 醫院行政人員 152  
| CAROLE MIGDEN         | Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal | 管理人員／經濟策劃員 153  
| ALAN S. WONG          | Incumbent/En el Cargo | 現任社區大學校董 154  
| SAL ROSSELLI          | Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios | 商業經理 155  
| JOHN RIOORDAN         | Incumbent/En el Cargo | 現任社區大學校董 156  

---

**Vote for One**

**Vote por Uno**

**Vote for no more than Three**

**Vote por no más de Tres**

---

**ELECCIÓN GENERAL**

**SCHOOL/ESCOLAR**

November 2, 1992

---
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## Member, Board of Supervisors

### Miembro, Junta de Supervisores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Tocco</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tom</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Nelder</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Lagos</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lee Eng</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bradley</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Boom Boom</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Day</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A. DeYoung</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Dolsin</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis Leonard Anthony Keys</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Ann McMahon</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Maher</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. &quot;BelE Starr&quot; Moseley</td>
<td>Artist-Artorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Moncur</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultant</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Coleman</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard D. Hongisto</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Wharton</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris M. Ward</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy G. Walker</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Squeri</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Farmer</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Talamante</td>
<td>Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $520,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

FOR 186  
AGAINST 187

COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.

FOR 190  
AGAINST 191

VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.

FOR 194  
AGAINST 195

LAKE TahoE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $85,000,000.

FOR 198  
AGAINST 199

FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.

FOR 202  
AGAINST 203

PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.

YES 206  
NO 207
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#### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NÚMERO</th>
<th>PROPUESTA</th>
<th>DESCRIPCIÓN</th>
<th>DETALLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1982</td>
<td>Esta acta da permiso para emitir emisiones de bonos por $500,000,000 para la provisión de fondos para la construcción de escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMPEÑO DE CAPITAL PARA CARACTERÍSTICAS DE CONDICION DE 1981</td>
<td>Esta acta da permiso para la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y repuesto de carreteras y ejecución de mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982</td>
<td>Esta acta da permiso para emitir emisiones de bonos por $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE</td>
<td>Esta acta da permiso para la compra de propiedad en la Cuenca de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para preservar las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación antrópica y preservar los valores pintorescos y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es $85,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRA DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982</td>
<td>Esta acta da permiso para emitir emisiones de bonos por $200,000,000 para financiar la compra de casas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SI A FAVOR</td>
<td>INVERSION DE FONDOS DE PENSION PÚBLICO</td>
<td>Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos previsionales de acciones comunes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>INVERSION DE FONDOS DE PENSION PÚBLICO</td>
<td>Publican que los fondos de pensiones son una inversión segura y rentable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1982年州校舍租—購公債法案。
1981年監獄基建費公債法案。
1982年退伍人員公債法案。
購置太浩湖公債法案。
1982年第一次買屋者公債法案。
公共養老金投資，准予州議會授權在特定普通股票投資更大的比例，制定受託投資的標準，財政影響，一旦付諸實施，可能會因利息和資本的增值而增加收益的機會，但風險亦大，以致用作投資的公共養老金和退休金可能要承擔資金的虧損。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Taxation. Real Property Valuation</td>
<td>Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from &quot;newly constructed&quot; definition.</td>
<td>No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.</td>
<td>YES 211</td>
<td>NO 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Temporary Transfer of Funds by Local Governments for Maintenance</td>
<td>Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing &quot;taxes&quot; to anticipated &quot;revenues&quot;. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 215</td>
<td>NO 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School Textbooks. Nonpublic Schools</td>
<td>Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 220</td>
<td>NO 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unifying Superior, Municipal, Justice Courts</td>
<td>Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 225</td>
<td>NO 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beverage Containers</td>
<td>Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 229</td>
<td>NO 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nuclear Weapons</td>
<td>Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES 233</td>
<td>NO 234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TASACION VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura encuadrar la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por reciclaje automático o sistemas de alarma de la definición de “reconstrucción”. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumente: Pérdida desconocida para poblaciones locales de réditos de impuestos a la propiedad y un aumento en los costos de evaluación. Un aumento desconocido en costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos para escuelas, universidades, hospitales y comunidades, y posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales. Un aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los descuentos de impuestos a la propiedad.

TRANSFENENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambia los usos de líneas y pago previstos de “impuestos” acumulantes a “réditos” asignados. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Según detalles del Analista, podían reducir los costos de interés de la agencia que recibe el préstamo y, al mismo tiempo, reducir el interés que normalmente hubiera sido generado de otra manera por agencias que no reciban préstamos.

TEXTOS ESCOLARES, ESCUELAS NO PÚBLICAS. Autoriza la provisión de textos en una base de préstamo. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Al instrumentarse, los costos administrativos se podrían reducir.

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado privado y un voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal. Al instrumentarse, costos aumentados para el estado y los condados para los jueces elegidos, y costos administrativos desconocidos.

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de rembolsos de cinco centavos o más que deben ser pagados a devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el costo de este impuesto. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y desecho de desperdicios sólidos. Se puede aumentar o disminuir la cantidad desconocida de cocaína y papeles del analista al explicar las variables.

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que se presente a cada presidente para que se dé cuenta de su reduce a la Unión Soviética un año en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.

地方政府暫時轉移資金用作維修。修正限制，價值基準由應計“稅捐”改為“預期稅收”。財政影響：無直接財政影響。據分析員的評述，它可能減輕借款的機構所負擔的利息，反過來說，非借款機構則可賺取的利息則受到削減。
## WATER RESOURCES
Addes statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION
Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GUNS
Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

### A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 1% of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECURSOS HIDRÁULICOS.** Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permite asignaciones para aguas fluyentes, usos del Río San Francisco y reglamenta el consumo excesivo crítico de aguas fluviales. **Impacto fiscal:** No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1.48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de mitigación; pérdida desconocida de réditos de arriendo eléctrico y altorres desconocidos de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

**COMISION DE NUEVO PROBADO.** Abroga el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo probatorio y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo programa de distritos legislativos y de igualación empezando con las elecciones de 1994. **Impacto fiscal:** Basado en pronunciamientos del Analista, hubo un aumento de costos estatales de $126,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable una vez cada 10 años empezando en 1991.

**ARMAS DE FUEGO.** Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidas en el Estado. Prohibe la prescripción legislativa absoluta de la posesión de armas de fuego. **Impacto fiscal:** Impuesto imposible de determinar. Aumenta los costos administrativos que deben ser facturados en su totalidad. Podría afectar los réditos de impuestos a la venta y la renta. Ve el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los aranceles.

**PROPUSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Voto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>SI 賛成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>NO 反對</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A** ¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una oficina para quejas de ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de ciudadanos sobre mala conducta de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

**B** ¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, exceder de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deberán anotarse en el 1 de 1 centavo de cada $100 de gasto? No deberán anotarse en el 1 de 1 centavo de cada $100 de gasto, sin embargo, por las partes particulares y sin ser creadas ninguna deuda o obligación sobre la ciudad?

**C** ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarlos para asistir a partes particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolsos por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda o obligación sobre la ciudad?

**D** ¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a las campañas sobre inflación de los empleados activa o jubilados en la misma forma que la ciudad subvención a los empleados activa o jubilados al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

**E** ¿Deberá el Concejo de Desastres e Incendios y de Defensa Civil autorizar al Concejo de Desastres e Incendios y de Defensa Civil a poner en marcha una operación deDefensa Civil en caso de necesidad?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proposition F has been removed by the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7 1/2% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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← 261 SI 贊成
← 262 NO 反對

E ¿Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

退休制度內的成員的未亡配偶，目前可享受獲補助金，如果他們在 60 歲後再婚，應否
繼續享受這種補助金？

← 267 SI 贊成
← 268 NO 反對

G ¿Deberá pagarse a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

每一市參議員應否發給年薪 $23,924 元？

← 270 SI 贊成
← 271 NO 反對

H ¿Debe el tipo de contribución para los empleados municipales de la ciudad el Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse al 1½% de la compensación de estos empleados?

市維勤務員工對退休制度的捐費額，應否定
為其薪酬的 1½ % ?

← 273 SI 贊成
← 274 NO 反對

I ¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación a Incapacidad para los empleados que hayan trabajado en el Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1º de noviembre de 1982, teniendo en cuenta los gastos de mantenimiento de los mismos a futuro?

警察局在 1982 年 11 月 1 日之後僱用的
穿制服警員，應否設立新的退休計劃和殘障保
險計劃？現任警員亦有權從現有的計劃轉移到
新的計劃？

← 276 SI 贊成
← 277 NO 反對

J ¿Deberá pagarles a los miembros de la Junta de Supervisores por tiempo y medio o deberán cobrar tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajar en días feriados, según lo solicite el oficial?

警察加班或在假日執行職務，應否每小時
發給一小時半的薪酬或僱員要求每日補回一目
半的休息時間？

← 279 SI 贊成
← 280 NO 反對

K ¿Deberá ser la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enmendadas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?

市參議會應否訂出各種步驟和目標，調查
研究關於把舊金山電力收歸公有的可能性，並
在調查研究完成之後，為取得該公用事業提交
選民在選舉中付諸表決？

← 282 SI 贊成
← 283 NO 反對

L ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco no construir rampas de paso en la entrada a City Hall, bien sea la ubicación en la Calle Polk o a la ubicada en Avenida Van Ness?

市政府大廈在橫街及圍街的人口處不修建
通道是否應烏舊金山市、縣政府的政策？

← 285 SI 贊成
← 286 NO 反對

M ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico de la Northgate y el Centro Médico U.C., específicamente la propiedad para su ubicación?

為了批准在卡諾斯南岸醫療綜合大樓和加
州大學醫藥中心地區興建一座公營酒店，分區
條例應作修改，並註明該產業的所在地，這是
否應烏舊金山市、縣政府的政策？
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:

#16—Area East of  (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN  (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of  (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:

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

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:

#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3)

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
   • three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
   • two State Senate Districts (SD 3, 8)
   • two United States Congressional Districts (CD 5, 6)
   See map elsewhere in this pamphlet

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
   State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
   State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
   United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
   • mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters’ handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney

My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olcomendy, Albert Wolffenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalich, Albert Axelfred.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lacey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART’s improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I’m concerned about BART safety and San Francisco’s need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committee, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific’s payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quintin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:
— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: "The people don’t care.”
— “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police "decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who's Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

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

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above

My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glasser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christiann H. Keith, 325-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Proletarian
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32


Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1355-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Cosshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloes M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phos - Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for
Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate.
Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's
statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have
been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadr, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary L. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Pothereod Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divuadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave, Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 223 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St, Employment Specialist
William K. Cobenitz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Sampa Lane, Legislative Director L.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Conner, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St, Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukisich, 177 Aliso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilaturas, Minister
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36

Diana Coleman

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacquelyne E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 2-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Elliott, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1596 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomesen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Weise, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

GREG DAY
My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist
My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality . . . safer neighborhoods . . . stronger rent control . . . affordable housing . . . control downtown growth . . . employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Clevel Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minton, 636 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dent. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randi Stallings, 597-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shradler St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotions Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JERRY R. DE YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1825-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 325 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilacion, 88 Waterville St., Distribution Att’D Sr.
Lowell Hillis, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst./Secretary
Steven Sums, 1305A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Personal Cook
James C. Stambursky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Sumner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Background: Native San Francisco. Combat Veteran WWII-Korea. Master’s Degree, San Francisco State; Second Master’s and Ph.D., U.C., Berkeley. Taught Balboa High, City College, 1955-Present. Served as San Francisco Supervisor and School Board Member-President. Married, three children.

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond I. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruschea, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coornradt, 631 O’Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
James P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. Maceo, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O’Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706axon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samaras, 264 Dailewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveller.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

Kenneth L. Farmer
My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a super-visor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Blevins, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jaret L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Iris Crenshaw, 559 Walker St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliott, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitsch, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1125 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:
Ted Askens, 1882 Green St., Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Belli, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Muden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma PETERSVILLE, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Straus, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla T. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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RICHARD D. HONGISTO
My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me # 2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lia Triff Beli, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Berstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvie, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agiropo R. Cerbuts, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belissi Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Direct. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbis, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esto, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. S.F. Public Library Commission
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keeffe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 527-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Pett, 350 Arbello Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 655-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES
My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55
My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinskey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dea Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McClum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macelli, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dillon, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Colon, 1311-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macelli, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Deter.
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wil. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachelle Cottonrender, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:
Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Cautrett, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Bertis, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arbello
My occupation is Urban Planner
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:
Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beasley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blitzen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kaiman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 4118A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 729 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilsie, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California’s major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must break the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Ewbank, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Laborer’s Union
George Foss, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessey, 1400 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Curt Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member,
Na’iir Women’s Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O’Keefe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer’s Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Ye, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

BETTY ANN McMAHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco’s future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Currivan, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Pete L. Forsland, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Honn, 2222 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melanieh, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Miurara, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapiro, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shina, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Robert Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shrader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank
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ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and having a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.

I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Americ Azevedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Melanie F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 834 Colton St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Dudum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Locksley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alanna Hartzok, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hiranayashi, 3777 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patrick Rose, 413 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahourich, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Seroffani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Montecello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipler St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paullette Burks, 1723-70th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loretta L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Circe Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paula "Ralf" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Liveni, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Stocklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1436 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen’s Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:
— Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
— Making Muni responsive and affordable,
— Creating needed services for seniors,
— Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing,
— Assuring healthful drinking water,
— Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
John T. Pang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Ellis St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lety” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women’s Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr.
Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

Wendy Nelder

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempst, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It’s time for a change!

Robert Squeri

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:

Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Bonchetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOsuna, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Guibengay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Casadena St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaffe, 1708 Fillert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Kohne, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. Lanane, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Robert Squeri
OLGA TALAMANTE

My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.  

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO

My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:

Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR Am. Legion
George R. Can, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1813-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3378 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68% Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-30th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latino, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VPW Post 4103

Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur's Union Local 265

Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union Local 38
John Viberg, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters Local 860

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:

Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Goselin, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudbird, 2727 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishihashi, 1360 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franconia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliot, 396 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliot, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 299A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Murcell, 1323 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabinu, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emmet Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldamando, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shadrac, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BEN TOM
My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city’s communities, leaders and constituencies.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Michael P. Szabo, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Aga Jaacks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Jim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Paul Lee, 599 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Argentina C. Brint, 62 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Mary Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunato Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtsclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heath Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., President, L.W.U.
Russ K. Kadish, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 432 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belsie Daley, 759 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Del, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 656-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 25 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER
My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 170 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 39 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvce, 234 Gaters St., Attorney
Leon Brusca, 35-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Staney St., Commissioner
Joseph Friesia, Jr., 336 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraud, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodhelt, 2060 O’Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 30 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Wally St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bovena, Public Relations
Ray Pachter, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennesi, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 708 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Evison St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Barton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1309 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1400 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 453 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Estevé, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor’s Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Horman, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomatara N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilarius, Minister

DAVE WHARTON
My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42


San Francisco needs a new voice.

I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.

Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I’ll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff’s Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 590 Pogue St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Mortimer Fleishacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garell, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Linnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1004 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lahlhalin, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2358 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Mencini, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morton, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc, Executive
Peter J. Nordoza, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsay B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neport, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O’Hern, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1990 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Batard, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr. 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Ceballos, 80 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Park Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3322 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hghts, Blvd., Publisher
Ladue Farfan, 1322 Funston, Chair. Comm. Advis. Comt. Special Education
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Goosby, 399 Hydeow Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Lenoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 130 Caseius Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocan, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanici, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Tom, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA

My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:

John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heath Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arballo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taqi-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giori, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanretty, 38 Mipah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkurt, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committee
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 406 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Mooser, 1763-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veteran Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramón P. Navarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Petitt, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 316-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:
- New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.
- Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using college Time Class Schedules for students’ and teachers’ programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.
- Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shinnmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barcojo, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1250-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Suppl.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Palls, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solaris, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Sucke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tesman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Ziski, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Fiori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Stu Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Grey, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agripino Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denbeche, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Diane Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hannessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margal Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth A. W. Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Marzey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemirovski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 66 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Folsom St., Labor Union Official
Burl Toler, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 640 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statistic bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.
People will control education when government doesn’t!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco’s Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women’s Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers’ Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Way, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guererro St., State Gov’t. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Phylis Lyon, 631 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pincher, 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hillritus, Minister

The Sponsors for George L. O'Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DaPrato, 374 Laidley, Physician
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroell, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Doney, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Cliffor Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ina W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeltz, 130 Cliffor Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Bailout Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Pennie L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director

My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:
Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgort, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Wallace G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert J. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Willard N. Levin, 211 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6623 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association
President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2955 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terheyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Aleso Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1946-32nd Ave., Retired
Frederick J. Whitman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 254 Yerbua Lane, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 877 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1590-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Hahfeld, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lecardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heath Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Messey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Issodore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-50th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 65 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-50th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Sturr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board.
My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:
Booker T. Anderson, 1735 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCDC
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 277-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women’s Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chinn, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Doonan, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 535 Post Street, Member, Board of Commissioners, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President, ILEU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:
Bartholomew Lee, 3375 Fillmore, Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O’Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1050 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakins, 3150 Heywood Ave., Community Switchboard

Robert E. Burton

Robert A. Da Prato

My address is 374 Hayes
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Fillmore St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O’Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1050 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakins, 3150 Heywood Ave., Community Switchboard

Robert A. Da Prato

Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Connell, 1931 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O’Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goeltz, 130 Cliff St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Coughman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Cliff Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-28th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Pennie L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1456-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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CAROLE MIGDEN
My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
— to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
— to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
— to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Brunno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agrippino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Deneboim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Ellaiser, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessee, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant

Agar Jaacks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Amstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1459 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomma N. Scott, 1919 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eversen Street, Facilities Management
Aro Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Paralegall
Timothy R. Wolfried, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLIN,
M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:
George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Deacresenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Maclechlan, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assst.
Alfred Kielwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assst.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 1424 Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Susan Rogers, 1662 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cork, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilyn Sperber, 2400 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevor, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gannon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Deacresenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice: Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

SAL ROSSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denehein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Van Ness, Member of San Francisco
Tom Ammann, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Gary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive Leroi King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waverly St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vuksich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirius, Minister

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Iodara Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary J. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 2519-25th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Hereman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth Z. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Statistics Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Maguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florencce F. Sinott, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tohriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Moncada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 31 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ALAN S. WONG
My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripino R. Cerbaton, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennesssey, 1400 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820 - 47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmon, 19139 Middleford Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sirar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilttitas St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER: City Hall, day. Apply now in Room 155 Work at the polls on election day.

快！有什么好方法是有趣的、帮助邻居、同时可以增加收入？

答案：

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

hora municipal
Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Las elecciones. Ofreciendo una solución en los lugares de votación del día de
**SFPD Citizen Complaint Office**

**PROPOSITION A**

Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen's Complaints within the Police Department.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “A”**

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “A”**

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens’ complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators’ salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens’ complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That’s just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer's authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A


— MOSCONÉ MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCONÉ MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don't demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This is another ludicous Hayden-Fonda “Committee for Economic Democracy” proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of “fat” APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the “POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT” are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it’s efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can “dream up”, more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960’s that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a “cure-all”, but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”
On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our over-crowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Únicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

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

PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller's Statement on "C"

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

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 88.

How Supervisors Voted on "C"

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


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs . . . Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!

Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP D APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco
Endorsed by:
John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Richard D. Hongisto
Lee Dolson
Wendy Nelder
Carol Ruth Silver
Harry G. Britt
Nancy G. Walker
Willie B. Kennedy
Doris M. Ward
F. Walter Johnson
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee’s surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee’s surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!
Vote yes on E.
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one "provider" and one "dependent" in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition "E" are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES. Vote "YES" on Proposition E.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse's life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: "The costs cannot be accurately determined."

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said "Quote" "The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it's a new field. We have no actuarial data."

"We also do not know how many people the plan would affect."

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:
William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO
Supervisors’ Salary

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”
On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((($9,600)) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it’s the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors’ current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors’ salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco’s taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS’ SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccari
Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermoso
Willis Hannawalt
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Feilhauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sozzi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Alphonso J. Smyth
Joan Willemen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emelyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jabe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Grath

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Beatie Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farkstein
John and Madeline Sherin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibach
Dorothy Nissley
Caroline Bihn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramus
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carl
Rita Dallmonti
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carey
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garbaldy
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavellini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Martel
Frank Vaccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cruzan
Walter G. Jabe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerald Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Luebello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongi
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Glynn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Loma Follett
William McGrath
Supervisors’ Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor’s salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

• The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

• Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

• People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

• A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

• Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it’s the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let’s break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually

11 x $9,600 $105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1,960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11

259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per

month — $21,450 annually times 11

235,950

Total $600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote “NO”!!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committee)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors’ pay to 25% of the Mayor’s salary): “The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time.”

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 12% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
(Resident Committee)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committee)
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide "Fixed" employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on "age at entry" into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on "age at entry" is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a "fixed" rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, "age at entry" rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City's rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time, but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years' cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers' Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

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

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under Section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,

(Continued on page 90)
Police Retirement

PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult cir-

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

The challenge of effective law enforcement in today's society of high and rising crime rates requires competent men and women from all backgrounds and walks of life. At a cost of approximately 99 cents a month, you can help create one fair system of compensation and at the same time help the San Francisco Police Department become competitive in recruiting the finest people for the job.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROP. I

Bob Barry
President S.F. Police Officers Association
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore
Gordon Lau
Former Supervisor
Phillip Burton
Member of Congress
Chuck Ayala
Director, C.Y.O.
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
John Foran
State Senator

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

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour’s pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour’s pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police
Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

-San Francisco Police Officers Association

Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote "YES"!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.
Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章：工作良機

你可以在十一月三日，播市選舉日工作。特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘，在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票。請往市政廳（濱街高街)一五五室申請。
PROPOSITION K
Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition, this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E's Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you're right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 "public power" cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn't pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city's hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy's cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go "public power". And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto (public)</td>
<td>$11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding (public)</td>
<td>$12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (public)</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote YES on K.

Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Eulalia Frausto  Corinne Fregoni  Richard Gaikowski  Golden Gate Alliance  Dan Goldstein  Dr. Zuretti Goody  Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council  Vincent Hallinan  Sue Hestor  Joe Hughes  Espanola Jackson  Candice Jensen  Judy Kaplan  Alison Brennan Kwasnik  David Looman

Thomas McCarthy  Leonel Uriarte Monterey  Anne Moore  Robert Moore  Arthur Morris  Jack Morrison  Nob Hill Neighbors  Michael Nolan  Richmond Involved In Safe Energy  San Francisco Democratic Club  San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee  Cynthia Sharpe  Frances Shaskan  Stanley Shields  James Shueh
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Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

*Emond Coleman, CPA*  
*Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.*  
*Economist*  
*Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.*  
*Professor of Economics*  
*John Hardeny, Ph.D.*  
*Economist*  
*Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.*  
*Economist*

*Richard Liebes, Ph.D.*  
*Economist*  
*Marc Lumer, CPA*  
*J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.*  
*Professor*  
*Mark Northcross*  
*Fiscal and Energy Consultant*  
*Lee Schultz, CPA*  
*Dick Van Aggelen, CPA*

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate *Bob Geary*

(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman *Arlo Hale Smith*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

*Darrell J. Salomon*  
*Civil Service Commissioner*

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON “K”

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we'd have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we'd be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930's, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON “K”

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

*Quentin L. Kopp*
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Brit, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxes Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&E. $27,107,028

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as $15 million).

*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.

*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).

*A huge new City administrative staff.

*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds. The City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hasch
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”
Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)
Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote “Yes” on Proposition “L”. Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote “Yes” on “L”.

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers’ money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco’s world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.

Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer’s dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The “Can’t use the side door” fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113’ uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient “off-street” access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson, 
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on “symbolism” to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractable, “costs be damned” career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to “butcher” the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn’t enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

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

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

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls ... a national landmark.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition "L" denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years, architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition "L" would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition "L" is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on "L" for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamonte, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor's Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Weslia Whitfield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarrfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Guy Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodale
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sondia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McCartney Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panhren
Tim Wolfred, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatrical Rhonoceros
Dmitri Beter
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rutberg

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

Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal Council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeeman

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

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1
S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller's Statement on "M"

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
L.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samurzesc, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardenman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco's housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project's site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting YES on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O'Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O'Connell
William Sepatitis
David Finn
Sylvia Durance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery

E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery

Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery

Cowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology

Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine

Devon Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology

Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology

Herbert Deo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology

Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology

Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery

William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery

Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research

Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry

Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology

Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine

Howard Shapiro, M. D.

Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology

John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology

Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology

Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAX PAYERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

W. F. O'Keefe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Souls
Gene Prat
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:
VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People

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

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote “NO” on Proposition “M.” Your “NO” vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition “M” is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting “NO” on Proposition “M.”

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition “M” is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A “NO” vote on Proposition “M” will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter’s public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning.

VOTE “NO” ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardin Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Bardin
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed "medically oriented" use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other "ancillary commercial areas" in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote "NO" on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote "NO" on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-A什BURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-SHIBUHY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SU TraO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

San Francisco Civic Associations

SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRiANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCiON LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal misuses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider’s Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area’s major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioneers and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-crowded, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock  Ellen Huppert
Dr. Robert Brigante  Peter Huppert
Dr. Kenneth Brown  Dr. Lester Jacobson
Dr. Francis Chamberlain  Paul Johnson
Dr. Joan Cucek  Jackie Lalanne
Mile Cucek  Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Mary Dallman  Dr. Matthew LaVail
Dr. Peter Dallman  Margaret Northcott
Norma Dennes  Kenny O’Hara
Dr. Richard Dennes  Alvin Pelavin
Dr. Roberta Fenlon  Marion Robertson
Jean Ferdinandsen  Burton Rockwell
Nan Freitas  Nicky Salan
Ann Gilliam  Dr. Donald Sandler
Harold Gilliam  Mary Sandler
Dr. Sadja Greenwood  Dr. Alan Scolnikoff
Richard Harrington  Suzanne Scolnikoff
Granger Hill

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don’t let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park’s skyline. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section, 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
(Proposition A, Continued)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually thereafter for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

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

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ((in amount not to)) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
(Proposition B, Continued)

shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinabove described; (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions; (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction, or extension of any utility, under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.)) (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION C

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

7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D

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

8.428 Health Service System Fund

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION E

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

8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Any allowance heretofore terminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION H
(Continued from page 70)

the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service. “Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” and “death benefit.”

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms “miscellaneous officer or employee” or “member,” as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¼</td>
<td>1.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59½</td>
<td>1.9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¾</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.9750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued)

revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(D) 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 benefit 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 subsection (b) of this section, and he has designed 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 (C), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) 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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1/2 percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon his death, the balance of such member’s retirement account, if any, shall be payable to his legally appointed guardian if he has children, or to such other person to whom the member has assigned his retirement account. If the member has no children and has not assigned his retirement account to another person, the balance of such member’s retirement account, if any, shall be payable to the city and county for deposit in the retirement fund.

(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 amount to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.502 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 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 manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.)

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement, and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be charged only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(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.
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in sections 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

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

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

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

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-2 Retirement
Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or, with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity
Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for retirement he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would have received if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would have received if retired under section 8.590-2, or upon the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance
If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the age of eighteen years but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of injury or onset of the illness which results in death if he had not remarried, or unless she was married to the member at least one year prior to his death if he had remarried.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983 or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit
If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit
Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service
The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member is qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:
(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.
(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.
(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds
All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½%) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.
(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, or at the later date of a periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-
(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year.

A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided,

however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

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

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half (in the judgment of the police commission) as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

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

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county;"

the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment District." In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to protect the character and stability of the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:

That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL 1:
Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of said lot 45; running thence easterly along said southerly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 32.664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right and running westerly 35.807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28.715 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2:
Portions of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28.715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30.234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35.808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30.424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35.807 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 3:
Portions of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58.949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31.051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44.798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence...
at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:
PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:
BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:
Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
BART DISTRICTS
District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
   LETRAS DE IMPRENTA
   Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
   Signature will be compared with ID on file in this office.

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

   3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
      ENVIAME LA BALOTA A:
      (Provide complete address)

      DATE: ____________________________  FÉCHA: ____________________________
      Zip Code: ____________________  Área Postal: ____________________

      Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
      Dirección del solicitante registrado en San Francisco
      (Provide complete address)

      IF YOU HAVE MOVED
      Complete this section if you have moved and
      now reside at an address other than that
      shown on your affidavit of registration.
      I moved on ____________________________ 19___
      My residence address is ____________________________
      Zip Code: ____________________
      NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior
to this election may obtain an
      absentee ballot. A voter moving more
      than 29 days prior to this election
      and who did not re-register prior to
      the registration closing date for this
      election is not eligible to vote.

      SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
      Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y
      reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que
      aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.
      Me cambé el ____________________________ de 19___
      Mi dirección es ____________________________  Área Postal: ____________________
      NOTA: Un votoante que se cambió dentro de los 29
días anteriores a esta elección puede
      obtener balota ausente. Un votoante que
      se cambió antes de los 29 días anteriores
      a la elección y que no se registró antes
      de la fecha final para registrarse de esta
      elección no puede votar.

      4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
         FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
         (Provide complete signature)

      5. Date
      Fecha
      Deputy Registrar

Mail To:
ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

Application MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, October 25
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS 5:00 DE LA TARDE,
MARTES, 25 DE OCTUBRE
7 DÍAS ANTE A LA FECHA DE LA ELECCIÓN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Propositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 285</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 296</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 283</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 279</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 271</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 277</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 274</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 271</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 277</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 274</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 271</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 277</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 274</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 271</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Third Class

U.S. Postage
Paid
San Francisco
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Carrier Route Presort

MAILING ADDRESS
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155 CITY HALL
Registrar of Voters
Jay Patterson

Election Day:
558-3417
Every Day:
558-3061
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**Governor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney General of California/Fiscal General of California</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH MARTINEZ</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcalde-Los Angeles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Professional Truck Driver/Caminero</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN P. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/Comerciante</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lieutenant Governor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MC CARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature/Asambleista, de la Legislatura de California</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Político</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL HALLETT, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Legislator/Farmer/Legisador Estatal/Granjero</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON A. MYERS, American</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secretary of State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GORDON DUFFY, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisador del Estado de California</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California/Secretario de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Candidate Details</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote por Uno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENNETH CORY, Democratic California State Controller/Consejal del Estado de California</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARY GINGELL, Libertarian Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM, American Independent Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciente</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD, Peace and Freedom City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom Steelworker/Herrerero de Obra</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent Analyst/Analista</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican Senior Assistant Attorney General/Asesor Fiscal General</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization—1st District</td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLINS, Democratic State Board of Equalization, Appointed Member, Five Districts/Departamento de Igualamiento, Miembro nombrado, los distritos</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAYNE R. NYGREEN, Libertarian Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H. &quot;BILL&quot; IVERS, Republican California State Legislator/Legislator del Estado de California</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United States Senator
Senador de Estados Unidos

Vote for One

DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom
Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro 太陽能工程師，教師
54 ➔

PETE WILSON, Republican
Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego 聖地亞哥市市長
55 ➔

JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian
Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía 經濟學教授
56 ➔

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic
Governor of California/Gobernador de California 加州州長
57 ➔

THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent
Printer/Impresor 印刷者
58 ➔

Representative in Congress—5th District
Diputado al Congresso — Distrito #5

Vote for One

PHILIP BURTON, Democratic
Member of the United States Congress/Miembro del Congreso Estados Unidos 美國國會議員
62 ➔

JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian
Newspaper Editor/Editor (Redactor) de Periódico 報紙編輯
63 ➔

MILTON MARKS, Republican
State Senator 5th District/Senador Estatal, Distrito No. 5 第五議區州參議員
64 ➔

State Senator—8th Senatorial District
Senador Estatal — Distrito #8

Vote for One

MICHAEL E. MAYAKIS, Libertarian
Community Switchboard President/Presidente de Tablero de Comunicaciones de la Comunidad 社區聯絡處主席
69 ➔

JOHN F. FORAN, Democratic
State Senator/Senador Estatal 州參議員
70 ➔

LEANNE C. GUTH, Republican
Business Administrator/Administrador de Comercio 商業管理人員
71 ➔

Member of the Assembly—17th Assembly District
Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #17

Vote for One

WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic
Speaker, California Assembly/Orador Asamblea de California 加州衆議院議長
75 ➔

THOMAS S. CRA'I, Republican
Lawyer/Abogado 律師
76 ➔

MICHAEL G. ZAHABAKIS, Peace and Freedom
Community Worker/Minister//Trabajador de la Comunidad/Clérigo 社區工作人員／牧師
77 ➔

BONNIE HOY, Libertarian
Abortion Rights Activist/Activista a Favor del Derecho al Aborto 報胎權利活動份子
78 ➔

3/17-8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</th>
<th>最高法院聯席法官</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shall FRANK K. RICHARDSON be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá FRANK K. RICHARDSON ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>最高法院聯席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall OTTO M. KAUS be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá OTTO M. KAUS ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>最高法院聯席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall ALLEN E. BROUSSARD be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá ALLEN E. BROUSSARD ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court</td>
<td>最高法院聯席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CRUZ REYNOANO be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá CRUZ REYNOANO ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One</td>
<td>上訴法院首席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN T. RACANELLI be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá JOHN T. RACANELLI ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</td>
<td>上訴法院首席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOSEPH R. GRODIN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá JOSEPH R. GRODIN ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</td>
<td>上訴法院聯席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JOHN J. MILLER be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá JOHN J. MILLER ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two</td>
<td>上訴法院聯席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall JEROME A. SMITH be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá JEROME A. SMITH ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three</td>
<td>上訴法院首席法官</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shall CLINTON WAYNE WHITE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>應否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿Deberá CLINTON WAYNE WHITE ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期內選任本公職?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1

Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1

Vote for One

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY
Attorney/Abogada

116

ALFRED G. CHANTELLI
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal

117

Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8

Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8

Vote for One

ROBERT SILVESTRI
Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte

121

ROBERT BARNES
Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes

122

EUGENE GARFINKLE
BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART

123

BOB GEARY
Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Presidente de la Junta Antisobreimpuestos de alcantarillado

124

NOTE
Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
| Superintendent of Public Instruction  | Vote for One  
Superintendente de Instrucción Pública  | 請選一名  
加州教育局長  |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------
| BILL HONIG  
District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar  | 校區學監 134  
加州教育局長 |
| WILSON RILES  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente Estadal de Instrucción Pública  | 135  |

| Member, Board of Education  | Vote for no more than Three  
Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco  | 請選不超過三名  
教育局委員會  |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------
| WILIAM FELZER  
Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería  | 工程教育家 139  
144  |
| GEORGE L. O'BRIEN  
Free Schooler - Economis Instructor/Escolar Libre - Instructor de Economia  | 自由教育者－經濟學教員 140  
141  |
| MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA  
Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces  | 實業經紀 142  
143  |
| MYRA KOPF  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  | 現任教務局委員 144  
舊金山教育局主席  |
| SODONIA M. WILSON  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  | 現任教務局委員  
胡明財  |
| ROSARIO ANAYA  
President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco  | 145  |

| Member, Community College Board  | Vote for no more than Three  
Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad de San Francisco  | 社區大學校董  
最多選三名  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------
| ROBERT E. BURTON  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  | 現任教社區大學校董 148  
152  |
| ROBERT R. BACCI  
Lawyer/Abogado  | 律師 149  
151  |
| MICHAEL S. BERNICK  
Professor/Agency Director//Profesor/Director de Agencia  | 教授／機構主任 150  
153  |
| ROBERT A. Da PRATO  
Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador  | 醫生;教育家 154  
155  |
| LELAND MOGLEN  
Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.  | 醫院行政人員 152  
154  |
| CAROLE MIGDEN  
Administrator/Fiscal Planner//Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal  | 管理人員／經濟策劃員 153  
155  |
| ALAN S. WONG  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  | 現任教社區大學校董 154  
156  |
| SAL ROSELLI  
Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios  | 商業經理 155  
156  |
| JOHN RIO RIAN  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  | 現任教社區大學校董 156  
156  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for no more than Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Compositor/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultor</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUERI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $85,000,000.</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.</td>
<td>YES 206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| N°  | 186 A Favor | 187 EN CONTRA | 188 ESTADO DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCION DE ESCUELAS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolso de capital para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas. | 1982年州校舍租－購公債法案。
|     | 贊成 | 反對 | 這個法案規定發行公債5億（$500,000,000），作興建或改善公共學校的資金。 |
| N°  | 190 A Favor | 191 EN CONTRA | 192 ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCEL DE CONDADO DE 1981. Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y repuesto de cárcel de condado y ejecución de mantenimiento diario en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000. | 1981年縣監獄基建債公債法案。
|     | 贊成 | 反對 | 這個法案規定發行公債2億8千萬（$280,000,000），用作興建、重建、改建和更新縣監獄，以及維修維修等費用。 |
| N°  | 194 A Favor | 195 EN CONTRA | 196 ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California. | 1982年退役人員公債法案。
|     | 贊成 | 反對 | 這個法案規定發行公債4億5千萬（$450,000,000），用作資助加州退役人員購置農場和房屋。 |
| N°  | 198 A Favor | 199 EN CONTRA | 199 ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE. Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Cuenca de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, y para preservar las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional. | 1982年太浩湖公債法案。
|     | 贊成 | 反對 | 這個法案規定發行公債8千5百萬（$85,000,000），用作維護太浩湖盆地實業，以防止這個獨特的自然資源環境的衰落，保護太浩湖的水土不致退化，保障太浩湖的風景和娛樂的價值。 |
| N°  | 202 A Favor | 203 EN CONTRA | 204 ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRADORES DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias. | 1982年第一次買屋者公債法案。
|     | 贊成 | 反對 | 這個法案規定發行公債2億（$200,000,000），用作資助買屋。 |
| N°  | 206 SI 贊成 | 207 NO 反對 | 208 INVERSION DE FONDOS DE PENSION PUBLICOS. Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentajes mayores en tipos preferenciales de acciones comunes. Prescribe normas de inversión fiduciaria. Impacto fiscal: De ponerse en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para el aumento de utilidades, lo cual podría acarrear perjuicio para los fondos. | 公共養老金投資，准予州議會授權在特定普通股票投資更大的比例，制定委托投資的標準。財政影響：一旦付諸實施，可能會因利率和資本的增值而增加收益的機會，但風險亦大，以致用作投資的公共養老金和退休金可能要承擔資金的虧損。 |
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 211 →
NO 212 →

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

YES 215 →
NO 216 →

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS. NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

YES 220 →
NO 221 →

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

YES 225 →
NO 226 →

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 229 →
NO 230 →

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 233 →
NO 234 →
TASACION, VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura estudiar la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por colaboración automática o sistemas de alarma de la definición de “recién construido”. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumentaliza: Pérdida desconocida para pueblos locales de réditos de impuestos a la propiedad y un aumento en los costos de evaluación. Un aumento desconocido en costos estatales para contrarrestar la pérdida de réditos para escuelas, universidades, museos de comunidades y, posiblemente, otros gobiernos locales. Un aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los descuentos de impuestos a la propiedad.

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambio en bases de límite y pago preventivos de “Imponentes” a “dulces” e incrementos. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Según detalla el Analista, podría reducir los costos de intercambio de la agencia que recibe el préstamo y, conversamente, reducir el interés que normalmente hubiera sido ganado de otra manera por agencias que no reciben préstamos.

TEXTOS ESCOLARES, ESCUELAS NO PÚBLICAS. Autoriza la provisión de textos en una base de préstamo tipo biblioteca a estudiantes de escuelas que no se encuentren bajo condiciones presupuestales. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta que sea instrumentado. Al insumir instrumentar, los costos podrán ascender $4 mil millones para un programa similar al de 1980-81 en los grados K-8, y $1 mil millones en grados 9-12. Costos administrativos desconocidos.

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo un voto mayoritario de los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta instrumentación. Al instrumentar, costos aumentados de salario y jubilación para el estado y/o los condados para los jueces auxiliares, y costos administrativos desconocidos a ahorros, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de reembolsos de cinco centavos o más que debe ser pagado al devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y descenso de desperdicios sólidos y un aumento o una disminución de cantidades desconocidas en recogida de réditos de impuestos. Vea el cálculo del Analista para explicación de las variables.

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobierno le escriba al Presidente para urdirle que le proporcione a la Unión Soviética un año en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.

ARMS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Presidente le escriba al Presidente para urdirle que le proporcione a la Unión Soviética un año en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.
WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237  →
NO 238  →

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1994 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241  →
NO 242  →

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245  →
NO 246  →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249  →
NO 250  →

B Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252  →
NO 253  →

C Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256  →
NO 257  →

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

YES 259  →
NO 260  →
RECURSOS HÍDRAULICOS. Aproape estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permiite asignaciones para aguas fluviales, en caso de Río Santos y reglamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de agua freática. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1,468 millones durante 5 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hídricos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de litigación; pérdida desconocida de ríos de arriate eléctrico y afluentes desconocidos de riego para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

COMISIÓN DE NUEVO PRORRATEO. Abroga el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo prorrateo y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo prorrateo de distritos legislativos y de igualización empezando con los elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en pronósticos del Analista, habría un aumento de costos estatales de $250,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable en cada 10 años empezando en 1991.


PROPÓSITOS DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO 市縣提案

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y aplicaciones relacionadas, excluirse de la limitación de que las deteles de costos policticos no deben exceder el 5% de cada $100 de ventas de propiedad taxada y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarés para asistir a partes particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones equipadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolsos por las partes particulares y sin creer ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los empleados sobrevivientes de los empleados activos jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

¿Deberá el programa de cobertura de la seguridad social, para el que se pagan las ventas de propiedad taxada, ser una cantidad fija para cada $100 de ventas de propiedad taxada, o un porcentaje de las ventas de propiedad taxada?

¿Deberá el programa de cobertura de la seguridad social, para el que se pagan las ventas de propiedad taxada, ser una cantidad fija para cada $100 de ventas de propiedad taxada, o un porcentaje de las ventas de propiedad taxada?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>YES 261</td>
<td>NO 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>YES 267</td>
<td>NO 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>YES 270</td>
<td>NO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>YES 273</td>
<td>NO 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>YES 276</td>
<td>NO 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>YES 279</td>
<td>NO 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>YES 282</td>
<td>NO 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>YES 285</td>
<td>NO 286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

261 SI 贊成
Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad.

262 NO 反對

267 SI 贊成
G ¿Deberá pagársela a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

268 NO 反對
每一市議員應否發給年薪 $23,924 元?

270 SI 贊成
H ¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados municipales de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse al 7 1/2 % de la compensación de estos empleados?

271 NO 反對
市務員員工退休制度的捐贈額，應否定為其薪資的 7 1/2 %?

273 SI 贊成
I ¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para miembros uniformizados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1 de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

274 NO 反對
警察局在 1982 年 11 月 1 日之後僱用的穿制服警員，應否設立新的退休計劃和殘障保障計劃？現任警員亦有權從現有的計劃轉移到新的計劃？

276 SI 贊成
J ¿Deberá pagárseles a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberán dar un tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajo en días feriados, según lo solicite el oficial?

277 NO 反對
警員加班或在假日執行職務，應否每小時發給一小時半的薪額或有其他要求每日補回一日半的休假時間？

279 SI 贊成
K ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para luego la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?

280 NO 反對
市參議會應否訂出各種步驟和目標，調查研究關於把舊金山電力收歸公有的可能性，並在調查研究完成之後，為取得該公用事業提交選民在普選中付諸表決？

282 SI 贊成
L ¿Deberá la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco no construir rampas de acceso en la entrada a City Hall, bien sea la ubicación en la Calle Polk o la ubicada en Avenida Van Ness?

283 NO 反對
市政府大廈在梭街及聞街的入口處不修建通路是否應為舊金山市、縣政府的政策？

285 SI 贊成
M ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificándose la propiedad para su ubicación?

286 NO 反對
為了批准在巴納薩斯岡醫藥綜合大樓和加州大學醫療中心地區興建一座私營酒店，分區條例應作修改，並註明該產業的所在地，這是否應為舊金山市、縣政府的政策？
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:

#16—Area East of ———— (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN ———— (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of ———— (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:

#3—Area NORTH of ///// (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of ///// (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:

#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3)

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

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
- mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters' handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a "write-in." If you want to and don't know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

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

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney
My education and qualifications are: Native San Francisco from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olcomendy, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing; Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran, Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCYEY

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lucey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART’s improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I’m concerned about BART safety and San Francisco’s need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I am a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor - two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary’s College; Master’s Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific’s payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinar and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:

— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: "The people don't care."
— "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police "decoy" operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who's Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years "Do-Nothing" Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammmable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

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

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32

Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jay" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3743-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christiann H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Dieckrich, 721A Shotwell, Aesthetic Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Cashal, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloe M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ibegani, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomasen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE
AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Bratt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripples, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fothoford Kiff, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margaret Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Theila Shelley, 70 Eversn St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebke, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boscetbo, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamont, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belsie Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director L.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskie Murphy, 2253 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouyee, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Petron, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukoich, 177 Aliso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister
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DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36

Diana Coleman

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist
My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality ... safer neighborhoods ... stronger rent control ... affordable housing ... control downtown growth ... employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshake, 2955 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Erie Gooby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 208 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Hegman, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Lassen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandi, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 390-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeleine Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Craner, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission
Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Debon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stardells, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist

My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality ... safer neighborhoods ... stronger rent control ... affordable housing ... control downtown growth ... employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shradar St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

JERRY R. De YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Elisco Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hildeon, 88 Waterville St., Distribution Ati’d Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst./Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Slumbergcy, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Sumner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Background: Native San Franciscan. Combat Veteran WWII-Korea. Master’s Degree, San Francisco State; Second Master’s and Ph.D., U.C., Berkeley. Taught Balboa High, City College, 1955-Present. Served as San Francisco Supervisor and School Board Member-President. Married, three children.

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond J. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruscher, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 452 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coonradt, 631 O’ Farrell St., Presbyter’s Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carroll Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters
Local 798
Terry A. Francisco, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lenier O’Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Sarrazes, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer
Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F.
Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Beany Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

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

MARTIN LEE ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:
Ted Aksnes, 1882 Green St, Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vandeventer, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St, Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Goog, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Hermann III, 128 Carl St, Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudder Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Petersline, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strauss, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trajillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wau, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St, System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER
My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a super-visor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulie Belleveaux, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jarett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irena Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 168 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliott, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kombrith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitzch, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Durrell White, 324 Barlett St., Houseman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:

— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
La Triff Bell, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Benstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agapito R. Corbito, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Pres. Lila Caneo, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Beisie Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Direct. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Library Commission
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1407-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shaffer Ave., Retired
John L. Molinaro, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Honolulu St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouyee, 627-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yuri Wada, 565-40th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Tern Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55

My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hail, 702 Andover St., Councilor
David L. Butler, 981 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 981 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pipsiey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
K. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Detor.
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Parnass, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachelle Cotonreader, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 916 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restauranteur
Lenore Cautionelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergers, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precest, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 754 Bush, Editor
Jose Bernstein, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Holand, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobies, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 195 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbia, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precinct, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3251 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 590 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tanya Lynn Lemons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Robe, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arborlo
My occupation is Urban Planner
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn’t do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beasley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Biethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowiski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morriss J. Comer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 355 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2250 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philmema Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalm, 1012 DeHar, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 4116A-4th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1315 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Polson, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1136 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER
My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 55
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California's major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres., S.F. Board of Education
Henry B. Berman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borcie, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dornan L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ira DeArman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres., Laborer's Union
George Foss, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sterilifie
James R. Herron, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1851-9th Ave., Board Member,
Nairl Women's Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Morcone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 544 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayer's Assoc.
Sandra A. Ohye, 857-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

BETTY ANN McMAHON
My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscoan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco's future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Currivan, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Fladig, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forslund, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Hohn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melaneph, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misrara, 2333 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3303 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Saprio, 66 Sotole Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave, Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Roberta Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorka St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shrader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERIC MONCUR
My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and having a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

K. F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY
My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city’s problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.

I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley “Belle Starr”

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burks, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Lorett L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Ciresi Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paula “Rafi” Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livets, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Malone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.,
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Julie C. Anderson, 375-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Ameris Azevedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Mebane F. Coon, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goottridge, Photographer
Shukri E. Dadum, 2407 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Leckley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 83 Clery Court
H. Alfred Hansen, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alanna Hartzok, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hirabayashi, 3377 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Isaga, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salmon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sabourin, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 330 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrofani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Montecito, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator
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WENDY NELDER
My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current President of Queen's Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:
- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable,
- Creating needed services for seniors,
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing,
- Assuring healthful drinking water,
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners. Wendy Nelder

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Jean-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonestreet Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Elise St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lefty” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-30th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Leon, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI
My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It's time for a change! Robert Squeri

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:
Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOssuna, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickinson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gulbenger, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaume, 1709 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Keilin, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmanno, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDI Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales
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OLGA TALAMANTE
My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO
My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:
Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Goslin, 1892B Market St.
Karen Hudiburg, 2725 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Francia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Mallett, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Mallett, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Teres Martinez, 2305 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purcell, 1322 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabina, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emnet Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldana, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Lagunita St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shrader, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Vrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:
Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR
Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethan W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forester, 55 Esie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68% Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Lano, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Emest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffer's Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 140 Gwerder, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38
John Vibe, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city's communities, leaders and constituents.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaccks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrupino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzlaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denbeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heath Rd., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President L.L.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Del Mar, Airways Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Beitlee Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Dii, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 55-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Meezy, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old, to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Philip Burton, 8 Skot Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellian, Assemblyman, California Legislation
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer, Planning Commissioner
Al Berice, 234 Gatien St., Attorney
Leon Brucher, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanyn St., Commissioner
Joseph Friesen, Jr., 3305 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2600 O'Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Boca, Public Relations
Kay Pachtier, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pentestri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Getrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
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DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Shot Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Wille L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Mollinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 89 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Eucalpy Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
AI Borvice, 234 Gats, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenta Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heg, Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Bety Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Holcomb, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jacks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Liu, 340-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomtra N. Scott, 19127 Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yoni Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hallitias, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42
San Francisco needs a new voice.
I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.
Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chery St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Dix, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 425 San Jacinto, Housewife
Mortimer Floshacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Foster, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garrel, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Loeh, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconti, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nordoza, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsay B. Navarete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neiport, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Hern, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 380 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1990 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscape
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stupski, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

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

ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education

My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Badis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers M.D., 82 Perula Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamore, 3323 Turvai, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Estes, 5285 Diamond Hgt. Blvd., Publisher
Ladde Farhan, 1322 Funston, Chair, Comm. Advac. Comt. Special Education
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Grooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guinraudes, 780-818 Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Deimar St., Airport Commissioners
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3362 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanie, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yoni Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRITCHON

DeOSUNA

My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52

My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of Deosuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:

John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3900-23rd Ave., County Central Committee
Catherine T. McCarthy, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arballo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taqi-Eddin, 1380-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgia, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Huratzy, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Junghurth, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committee
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curiel, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donalson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committee
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburg St, Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottanoro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottanoro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3351 Alemany Blvd, Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committee
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon P. Navas, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pettit, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 318-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

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

WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:

New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students’ and teachers’ programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agrippino Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carola Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denehem, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2000 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 O'soro St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 30-36-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lander, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Medzey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemirovsky, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burt Toler, 581 Grizzly, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:

Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lacey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shinnmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Ross Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-55th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julia Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Pecagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Joe, 1050 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Nortega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerzhoff, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barojo, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Supt.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Fain, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Testrnan, 1834-18th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weldy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Ziska, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Fiori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espedal, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN
My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor

My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don't want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn't!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.
My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Philip Burton, 8 Shatt Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Wille B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John M. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Rains Ave., Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2747-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hickley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Floyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 631 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouyee, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltiris, Minister

The Sponsors for George L. O'Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DaPrato, 374 Laidley, Physician
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1080 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Kathleen O'Shea, 3246-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-4th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Calhie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Krouli, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Bevery Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Doney, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 467 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goetzl, 130 Cliffotd Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ina W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goetzl, 130 Cliffotd Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Penne L. Voorhees, 325 Jones St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:

Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgart, 1 Astor, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 32 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Wallace G. Jebe, 514 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-414th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 231 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.

M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association

President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Tert Hedeyen, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Yuskich, 177 San Aloso Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director

My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Member at University of San Francisco and Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training and small businesses, and aids San Francisco steadily jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the quality of education and VOCATIONAL training that can lead to jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the City Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S.

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agripino R. Ceballos, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2223-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lecfaro Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Samoa Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 60 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 338 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Cen
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Sturr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Philip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women’s Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Flitney, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 625 Connecticut Street, President II WU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Agar Juicaks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-8th Ave., English Editor
Wille B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Mceder Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Theima Shelley, 70 Eveson Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official
Donis M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O’Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 920 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Rainondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O’Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goelitz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomaske, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haus, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goelitz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm/Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1315 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Culin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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CAROLE MIGDEN

My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
- to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento
- to ensure adequate state funding
- to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
- to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:

Morrice Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Bruno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Carave, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Duca, 11 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Elisei, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Maresa L. Hunt, 146-15th Ave., Public Affairs/Information
S.F.U.S.D.
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Arinstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Tomatna N. Scott, 1916 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLLEN,
M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:

George Quan, 1842 Mason St., Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tsao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Machachian, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kielwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assis.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 765-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjil, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marlyn Sperber, 2665 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Tovres, 2455-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gannon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agneta, 637 Connecticut, Assemanyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinaro, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denehein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Bosschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Harst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kroisenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
William Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 38 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouyee, 927-24th Ave., Administrator
F. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Fulton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukich, 177 Alesso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 365-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Moncada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

SAL ROSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shreader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary J. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 3518-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Delson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Riple, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadiash, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Pereodore Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.

Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 785-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Moncada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ALAN S. WONG
My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lilian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Scot Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agrupino R. Carballo, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2265-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pach, 79 Urnus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmel, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Publib Official
Julie Tung, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltitias St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER:

CITY HALL
Day: Apply now in Room 155
Work at the polls on election day.

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

otar mismo
Oficina 155 de la Alcaldia de la Ciudad.
Las elecciones. Obtenga más solicitudes en la
Trabaje en los lugares de votación de la de

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPPOSITION A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints' approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens’ complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators’ salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens’ complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That’s just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer's authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don't demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

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

This is another ludicrous Ilayden-Fonda “Committee for Economic Democracy” proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of “fat” APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the “POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT” are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it’s efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can “dream up” more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960’s that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a “cure-all”, but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting buses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet. VOTE YES ON “B”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!
Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52. Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Industrial Development Financing

PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

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


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 88.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C
As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C
Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk on these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs . . . Vote Yes on C.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote "NO"!!!
Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arla Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller’s Statement on “D”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “D”

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco
Endorsed by:
John L. Molinari Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne Board of Supervisors
Richard D. Hongisto Board of Supervisors
Lee Dolson Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward Board of Supervisors
F. Walter Johnson Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
**Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits**

**PROPOSITION E**

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

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarry.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition E provides that a City employee’s surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “E”**

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

---

**How Supervisors Voted on “E”**

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

---

**NOTE**

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

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!
Vote yes on E.
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one “provider” and one “dependent” in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition “E” are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.
Vote “YES” on Proposition E.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse's life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: “The costs cannot be accurately determined.”

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said “Quote” “The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it’s a new field. We have no actuarial data.”

“We also do not know how many people the plan would affect.”

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:
William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((($9,600)) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600—an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors death with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise—attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr., President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it's the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors' current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter. 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere "token."

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors' salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco's taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON "G"

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS' SALARIES.

Michael Lederman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Scanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccar

Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Antenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermoso
Willis Hanmiwalt

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

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that’s the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors’ pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can’t. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don’t have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON “G”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Fellhauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sozzi
Maxine and Walter Cramble
David and Carol Mullin
Aloyisus J. Smyth
Joan Willemsen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emolyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jefe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Groth
Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O’Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Beatrice Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farbstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Miback
Dorothy Nisley
Caroline Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander
Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramos
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carl
Rita Dallmoni
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marion Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garbaldi
Helen Vergas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bennie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini
Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Martel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cruzen
Walter G. Jibe
Mirmir Steinbeck
Gerald Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Lucibello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongier
Frances Condor
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Erhe Best
Walter and Kathleen Gynn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verne Ricci
Lorna Follett
William McGrath
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it's the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors' current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere "token."

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors' salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco's taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON "G"

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS' SALARIES.

Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scanell
Dennis Antonore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermoso
Willis Hannaway

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

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Marrel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cruzan
Walter G. Jebe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerard Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Luebello
Veronica Murray
Helen Norgier
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Glyn
Walter and Fern Feyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Loma Follett
William McGrath

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

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor's salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

- The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

- Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

- People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

- A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

- Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it's the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on "G"

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let's break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually $ 105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 $ 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per month — $21,450 annually times 11 $ 235,950

Total $ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON "G"

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors' pay to 25% of the Mayor's salary): "The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time."

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
(Republican Committeeman)

— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"
On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
"Miscellaneous" Employees’ Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide “Fixed” employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on “age at entry” into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on “age at entry” is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a “fixed” rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, “age at entry” rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City’s rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years’ cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers’ Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

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

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration, (Continued on page 90)
Police Retirement

PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller's Statement on “I”

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people, however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 1

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour’s pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour’s pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police
Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 15%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E’s Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you’re right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 “public power” cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn’t pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city’s hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy’s cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go “public power”! And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SANG FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

Palo Alto (public) $11.06
Redding (public) $12.35
Santa Clara (public) $14.50

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Sacramento (public) $15.00
San Francisco (PG&E) $34.28

Vote YES on K.

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachter, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richardson Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shanken
Stanley Shields
James Shoich
Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
UnitarianUniversalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Cara Wyland

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

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmund Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardsey, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist
Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)
Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait ’til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON “K”

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we’d have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we’d be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930’s, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON “K”

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a "feasibility" study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to "study" is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.'s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City's bureaucracy and then later to convert them to "consumer ownership."

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This "feasibility" study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.'s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City's Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer's money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.'s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 "consultant contract" to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and "round the clock" courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the "economical" construction of "SUPER SEWER", and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY P.G.&E. $27,107,028

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy's output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City's needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible "Municipal Power" foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco's voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let's save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco’s continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That “somewhere” is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another “feasibility study” but we will have thrown our City’s hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn’t mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital “lifeline” service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don’t sacrifice our City’s future on the flawed altar of “municipal ownership.” We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers’ money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner’s property (as much as $15 million).

*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.

*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).

*A huge new City administrative staff.

*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a “feasibility study” that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers’ money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hiseh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”
Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)
Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller’s Statement on “L”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:
Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.
Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.
A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers’ money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco’s world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer’s dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The “Can't use the side door” fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient “off-street” access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on “symbolism” to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, “costs be damned” career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to “butcher” the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn’t enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

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

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

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls.

...A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition “L” denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition “L” would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition “L” is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on “L” for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcellino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Briere
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamonte, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor’s Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Westia Whitfield
Lucille Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Koh, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodale
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodonia Wilson, Educator.
Jack Trujillo
Jane MeKauley Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolfred, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theahtre Rhinoceros
Dmitri Betser
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rutberg

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

Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

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

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller's Statement on “M”

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant
Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mészáros, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samarzes, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardenman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco's housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project's site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark          William Sapetidis
Michael Tuggle      David Finn
J. E. O'Guin        Sylvia Durance
Patrick Conley      Lyle Conley
Dorothy Campbell    Wilfred Willis
Helen O'Connell     June Sanchez
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Brodell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devron Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M.

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

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

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

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Soulis
Gene Prat
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:
VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P., in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote “NO” on Proposition “M.” Your “NO” vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition “M” is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting “NO” on Proposition “M.”

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition “M” is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A “NO” vote on Proposition “M” will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter’s public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE “NO” ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardis Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed "medically oriented" use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other "ancillary commercial areas" in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote "NO" on this special interest spot zoning. Vote "NO" on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

San Francisco Civic Associations
SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioneers and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Jean Cucuk
Mile Cucuk
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadia Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill

Ellen Huppert
Peter Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lalanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Mathew LaVail
Margaret Northcott
Kenny O'Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salan
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stonyans Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote "NO"!!!
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold** face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointee shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by boldface; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall (in amount not to exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
shall supersede the interin appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require: (2) for repairs and maintenance: (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described: (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions: (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureau thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal years 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)

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

7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
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8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System((4)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)
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8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years, and further provided that the provisions of this section shall be applicable only to the first such marriage.
the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

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

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6700</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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued)

revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

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

(a) 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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) 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 entitled him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

(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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) 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 entitled him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 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
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on such deductions according to service credited, shall be paid to the retirement system following the removal of such limit, in manners 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent of the total salary paid to the teachers unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one-half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraph 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(1) 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.

(1) 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.
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(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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 foregoing submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARITER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION 1

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

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

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member of the retirement system of the State of California, the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for the money for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earned" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

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

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of police officer, police woman, officer, or police matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 8.567 of this 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.
8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediate-ly prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have been qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
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was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the 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 spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 marriage, to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, “surviving spouse” shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. “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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
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city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under sections 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:

(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.6 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 1/2) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, 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 to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valua-
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Section shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided, however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, in so far as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

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

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

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

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half ((in the judgment of the police commission)) as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

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

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county;"

the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the “Downtown Assessment District.” In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:
It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to protect the character and stability of the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:
That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:
PARCEL 1:
Portions of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon “Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:
BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of said lot 45; running thence easterly along said southerly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 32,664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right 100 and running westerly 35,807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point of beginning.
PARCEL 2:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon “Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35,808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°28'39" to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the point of beginning.
PARCEL 3:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon “Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence
(Proposition M, Continued) at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4: PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows: BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5: PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows: BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6: PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights", filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows: BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7: PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights", filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows: BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8: PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows: COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9: BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10: Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at Pages 22 and 23. Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
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District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
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DAN P. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian 商人
Businessman/Comerciante

GEORGE "DUKE" DEUKMEJIAN, Republican 加州司法廳長
Attorney General of California/Fiscal General de California

ELIZABETH MARTINEZ, Peace and Freedom 作家、編輯、組織人
Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador

Lieutenant Governor

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom 州黨書記
State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Político

CAROL HALLETT, Republican 州議員／農民
State Legislator/Farmer/Legislador Estatal/Granjero

HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent 汽車商人
Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles

LEO T. MC CARTHY, Democrat 州衆議員
Assemblyman, California Legislature/Assembleista, de la Legislatura de California

JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian 餐館顧問／包辦伙食者
Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor

Secretary of State

MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian 商業顧問
Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic 州務卿
Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California

ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent 實業經紀
Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias

GORDON DUFFY, Republican 加州議員
California State Legislator/Legislador del Estado de California

MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom 貨倉工人
Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
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<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARY GINGELL, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“PAT” GRAHAM, American Independent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciente</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>California State Controller/Contador del Estado de California</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Treasurer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Analyst/Analista</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrero de Obra</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attorney General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laborano</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, State Board of Equalization — 1st District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NYGREN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. “BILL” IVERS, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisrador del Estado de California</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON, Republican</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representative in Congress—5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian</td>
<td>Newspaper Editor/Editor (Redactor) de Periódico</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican</td>
<td>State Senator 5th District/Senador Estatal, Distrito No. 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP BURTON, Democratic</td>
<td>Member of the United States Congress/Miembro del Congreso Estado Unidense</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Senator—8th Senatorial District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL E. MAYAKIS, Libertarian</td>
<td>Community Switchboard President/Presidente de Tablero de Conmutadores de la Comunidad</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN F. FORAN, Democratic</td>
<td>State Senator/Senador Estatal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEANNE C. GUTH, Republican</td>
<td>Business Administrator/Administrador de Comercio</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member of the Assembly—19th Assembly District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LES KELTING, Republican</td>
<td>Businessman-Taxpayers Advocate/Hombre de Negocios Defensor del Contribuyente</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly/Miembro de la Asamblea</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK PICKENS, Libertarian</td>
<td>Anti-Drug/Anti-Tax Activist/Activista Contra la Consecución/Contra Los Impuestos</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Justice</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court**

- For FRANK K. RICHARDSON
- For OTTO M. KAUS
- For ALLEN E. BROUSSARD
- For CRUZ REYNOSO
- For JOHN T. RACANELLI
- For JOSEPH R. GRODIN
- For JOHN J. MILLER
- For JEROME A. SMITH
- For CLINTON WAYNE WHITE

**For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal**

- For JOHN T. RACANELLI
- For JOSEPH R. GRODIN
- For JOHN J. MILLER
- For JEROME A. SMITH
- For CLINTON WAYNE WHITE

**For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal**

- For JOHN J. MILLER
- For JEROME A. SMITH
- For CLINTON WAYNE WHITE

**For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal**

- For JOHN J. MILLER
- For JEROME A. SMITH
- For CLINTON WAYNE WHITE
For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Three
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Tres

Shall BETTY BARRY-DEAL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 应否在法律所定之任期内连任本公職？ 应选/SI 105 →
¿Deberá BETTY BARRY-DEAL ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 反对/NO 106 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Cuatro

Shall WINSLOW CHRISTIAN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 应否在法律所定之任期内连任本公職？ 应选/SI 108 →
¿Deberá WINSLOW CHRISTIAN ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 反对/NO 109 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four
Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación
Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Cuatro

Shall MARC POCHE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? 应否在法律所定之任期内连任本公職？ 应选/SI 111 →
¿Deberá MARC POCHE ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? 反对/NO 112 →

Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1
Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY 116 →
Attorney/Aboigada

ALFRED G. CHANTELLE 117 →
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal

Vote for One
Preena un

Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8
Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8

ROBERT SILVESTRI 121 →
Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte

ROBERT BARNES 122 →
Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes

EUGENE GARFINKLE 123 →
BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART

BOB GEARY 124 →
Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Presidente de la Junta de Impuestos de Alcantarillado

Vote for One
Preena un

NOTE
Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART District #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
## Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Crichton de Osesuna</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>教育局委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Koff</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodonia M. Wilson</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario Anaya</td>
<td>President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Felzer</td>
<td>Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. O'Brien</td>
<td>Presidente, Economists Instructor/Instructor de Economía</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Education Bureau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Da Prato</td>
<td>Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland Moglen</td>
<td>Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Middendorf</td>
<td>Administrative/Fiscal Planner/Planificadora Fiscal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan S. Wong</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Rosselli</td>
<td>Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Riodan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Bacci</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael S. Bernick</td>
<td>Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer, Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Compositor, Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. &quot;BELLE STARR&quot; MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist, Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Evaluator, Valuador, Consultor</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant, Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney, Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUIERI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman, Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Director, YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant, Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist, Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher, Comerciante, Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student, Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant, Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above, Mosia del Cielo</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The document is in English and Spanish, with votes listed in numerical order.
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

FOR 186
AGAINST 187

COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.

FOR 190
AGAINST 191

VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.

FOR 194
AGAINST 195

LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $25,000,000.

FOR 198
AGAINST 199

FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.

FOR 202
AGAINST 203

PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.

YES 206
NO 207
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Propuesta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolsos de capital para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>EN CONTRA</td>
<td>1982 年州校舍租-調公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 5 億元（$500,000,000），作為興建及改良公共學校的資金。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARRERAS DE CONDADO DE 1981. Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelaje y reparto de cárceles de condado y ejecución de mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>EN CONTRA</td>
<td>1981 年縣監獄基建費公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 2 億 8 千萬元（$280,000,000），用作興建、重建、改級和更新縣監獄，以及維護維修等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>EN CONTRA</td>
<td>1982 年退役人員公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 4 億 5 千萬元（$450,000,000），用作資助加州退役人員購買農場與農舍。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE. Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Cueva de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger los arces de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar los valores paisajísticos y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es $85,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>EN CONTRA</td>
<td>購置太浩湖公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 8 千 5 百萬元（$85,000,000），用作購納太浩湖盆地資產，以防止這個獨特的自然資源環境的衰落，保護太浩湖的水土不致退化，保持太浩湖的景觀和娛樂的價值。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>A FAVOR</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRADORES DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>EN CONTRA</td>
<td>1982 年第一次買屋者公債法案。這個法案規定發行公債 2 億 2 千元（$200,000,000），用作資助買屋。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>SÍ A FAVOR</td>
<td>INVERSIÓN DE FONDOS DE PENSION PUBLICOS. Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos previstos de acciones comunes. Predicha norma de inversión fiduciaria. Impacto fiscal: Da potencia en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañadas por riesgo mayor para los fondos participantes, lo cual podría acarrear pérdidas capitales para los fondos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>NO EN CONTRA</td>
<td>公共養老金投資，准予州議會授權在特定普通股股票投資更大的比例，制定受托投資的標準。財政影響：一旦付諸實施，可能會因利息及資本的增值而增加收益的機會，但風險亦大，以致用資投資的公共養老金和退休金可能會承受資金的虧損。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 211      NO 212

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment basis from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

YES 215      NO 216

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $1 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

YES 220      NO 221

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

YES 225      NO 226

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solid waste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 229      NO 230

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 233      NO 234
TASACION. VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura excluir la construcción de sistemas de enfriamiento por radiación automática y sistemas de alarma de la definición de "residencia construida". Impacto fiscal: Ninguno impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumente: Pérdida desconocida para propietarios locales de reales de impuestos y en aumentos en los costos de evaluación. Un aumento desconocido en costos estables para confrontar la pérdida de réditos para escuelas, universidades, bienes de comunidades y, posiblemente, otras gobiernos locales. Un aumento menor en los réditos de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los descuentos de impuestos a la propiedad.

地方府政府市府轉移資金用作維修，修正限制，債權基礎由抵押“折價”改為“預期稅收”，財政影響，直接財政影響，照分析員的評估，可能減輕借款的機構所負擔的利息，反而來說，非借款機構所可賺取的利息則受到削減。

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo al de 1982-83 en los grados K-8, y $1 millón en grados 9-12. Costos administrativos desconocidos.

統一高等法院，地方法庭與審判法院。若經縣選舉人多數票通過，州議會可以在縣內統一各法院。財政影響，要在付諸實施後才會發生影...
WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237
NO 238

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241
NO 242

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245
NO 246

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249
NO 250

B Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252
NO 253

C Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256
NO 257

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

YES 259
NO 260
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

237 SI 贊成 13
238 NO 反對

RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuestas, permite asignaciones para aguas subterráneas, uno del Rio Stanislaus y reglamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de agua (realística). Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1.48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de medición; pérdida desconocida de la eficiencia de la producción de energía; y costos desconocidos de la eficiencia de la producción de electricidad. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

241 SI 贊成 14
242 NO 反對

COMISION DE NUEVO PRORBATE. Aboga el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo prorrateo e establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo prorrateo de distritos legislativos y de igualización termina con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en el presupuesto de la comisión, habrá un aumento de costos anuales de $125,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable cada año desde 1984.

245 SI 贊成 15
246 NO 反對

ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidos para el estado. Prohibe la prescripción de armas para propósitos de defensa personal. Impacto fiscal: Impacto imposible de determinar. Aumentaría los costos administrativos reembolsados por el estado, y costos desconocidos sobre el costo de mantenimiento del sistema de justicia criminal. Podría afectar los réditos de impuestos a la venta y la renta. Vea el cálculo del Analista para detalles de variables.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO 市縣提案

249 SI 贊成 A
250 NO 反對

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quemas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acciones al Jefe de Policía?

252 SI 贊成 B
253 NO 反對

¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y equipos relacionados con la ciudad de San Francisco? No deben superar 10% de un cálculo de $100 de cada $100 de sueldo de propiedad y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que superen esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

256 SI 贊成 C
257 NO 反對

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarlas para ayudar a partes particulares a adquirir, construir, y mantener instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolsos por las partes particulares y sin legal aumentar ningún daño u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

259 SI 贊成 D
260 NO 反對

¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a las cónyuges sobrevivientes de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados que pertenecen al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

10P
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes Vote</th>
<th>No Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition F Has Been Removed by the Board of Supervisors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Núm.</td>
<td>Asunto</td>
<td>Texto</td>
<td>Núm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Se deberá permitir al cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarsele a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados misceláneos de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse al 7½% de la compensación de estos empleados?</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1° de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá pagarseles a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberá dárselos tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajo en días festivos, según lo solicite el oficial?</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas en cambio para disminuir la proporción de noticias para lograr la propiedad pública de la tierra de servicio electrónico en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco no construir rumbos de acceso en la entrada a City Hall, bien se la ubicará en la Cola Poli a la ubicada en Avenida Van Ness?</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco reanudar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Paranasus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., específicándose la propiedad para su ubicación?</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

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

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

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

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3).

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

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
- going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
- mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters’ handbook.

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

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

**BONDS OR NOTES** — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

**BUDGET** — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

**CAPITAL COSTS** — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

**MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES** — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**POLLCING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

---

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

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42

My occupation is Attorney

My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Oломendi, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalic, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidaday.


Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57

My occupation is Lawyer

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lacey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessy, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer

My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant

My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:
— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: “The people don’t care.”
— “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police “decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who's Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above

My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2901 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-45th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 7547-17th St., Marijuaana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christina K. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 712A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Ralph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffitt St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32


Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 725-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloso M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Gosby, 725 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1386 Fell, Artist
Tod Nolan, 223-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Wells, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for
Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrac, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burson, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Presion Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Reitners
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, I.W.U
Ruth S. Kadiash, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotherodre Kidal, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 7561 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clifton Kelly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margaret Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tubbner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada 363-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Monteada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Danheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo Boscchetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cohentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Beilke Daley, 199 Guary, Executive Director
Ina Darman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hunt, 340 San Benito, Executive
Larry King, 75 Zumpa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1407-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKelvy Murphy, 2355 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouyeu, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scannell, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vuskich, 177 Aliso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 555-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Monteada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiramita, Minister
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN
My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36
My qualifications for office are: Supporter Spartacist, labor/socialists who organized stopping Nazi celebration of Hitler's birthday, San Francisco 1980, Union militant, six years CWA. Member National Association Letter Carriers. Break with — build a workers' party! Strike action to bring down Reagan! No gun control — labor/black defense against Klan/Nazi terror! For massive public works under union control! Jobs for all, decent housing, free medical care, childcare, education, transit! Full equality — minorities, women, homosexuals! Citizenship rights for undocumented workers! From Afghanistan to Poland to El Salvador — down with Reagan's anti-Soviet war drive! Throw out the capitalists! Seize banks, industry — no compensation! Establish workers' government

Diana Coleman

GREG DAY
My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist
My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality . . . safer neighborhoods . . . stronger rent control . . . affordable housing . . . control downtown growth . . . employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacquelyne E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carine M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshak, 2858 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Elliott, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katharine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1366 Fells, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-4th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Goury Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 485 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographic
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsunaga, 570 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Sinou, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stillings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

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

JERRY R. De YOUNG
My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:

Edward Cummick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4047A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andre Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Heathstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Elisea Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rudolph A. Hitacon, 88 Waterville St., Distribution Att'd Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst/Secretary
Steven Sams, 1595A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stambursky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Sumner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkie, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON
My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:

Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond I. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruschesi, 57-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coonradt, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim F. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAteer, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samaras, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Ben Y. Yee, 331 Martin Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveller.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.

Martin Eng can win!

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:

Ted Akins, 1882 Green St, Carpenter
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 663 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Melinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Laughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Volma Petersille, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 3049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Richie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Soherer, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strausz, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-23rd Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER

My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:

Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paullette Belliveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jaret L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irma Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliot, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Durrell L. McClure, 785 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitts, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Tronzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Durrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman
RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lia Triff Bell, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Benzein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvise, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agrupino R. Cerba, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belisle Daily, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Direct. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jobe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library
Commission
Leroy King, 758 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Pett, 350 Arbolio Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pitcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55

My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Anlounder St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinkey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCran, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Deborah
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 273 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 531 Prentiss, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachel Cettoonreader, 215 St.Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1322-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Mary Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer

My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trendsetting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Cautrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Bernsen, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Booker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roché, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspan, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arbello
My occupation is Urban Planner

My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beanley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Biehen, 1400 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 355 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 430 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 411B-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schetman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California’s major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

BETTY ANN McMAHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco’s future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Curran, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Fluding, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forsland, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Hohn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Meloney, 125 Juanita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2233 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Landsdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Landsdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapio, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Viscaino St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Roberta Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shrader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yanos, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 757-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Amerie Azevedo, 269 Cherry St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Melba E. Croom, 515 North St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 706 Goettinger, Photographer
Shelby E. Dismann, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Lockley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 955 Harrison St., Business Man
Alanna Hartz, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hiraibayashi, 3377 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3623 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard L. Lowry, 225-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5009 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahourieh, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrafani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shirley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.
I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burks, 1753-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatoia, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Lorett L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Circe Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paula "Ralf" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 413 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 289 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Steg, 3740-22th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen’s Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.
My priorities include:
— Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
— Making Muni responsive and affordable.
— Creating needed services for seniors.
— Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
— Assuring healthful drinking water.
— Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.
My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Fletcher, 61 Powelton, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 605 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-44th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Ellis St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavano, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lefty” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelen Burton, 2777-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women’s Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Yong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It’s time for a change!

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:
Alfred D. Baez, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschett, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOuna, 1574-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cuyuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrel, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Guibengay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Keohan, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. Laffitte, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1750 McAllister St.
Lucy Palumbo, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Marilyn L. Pearson, 1200 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1857-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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OLGA TALAMANTE
My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO
My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.
Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:
Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Gosein, 18928 Market St.
Karen Hudburgh, 2722 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franconia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan L. Duthum, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purcell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabins, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emmet Ct., Legal Worker
Albert Saldamando, 1563 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shadrak, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir.,
Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:
Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC
AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ref. Electrician, Past CMDR
Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2988-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannah, 6806 Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanagh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latino, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffer's Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38
John Vibe, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zumacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city's communities, leaders and constituents.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaicks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Lin P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Height St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Deneheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President I.L.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadiash, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belsie Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoriada Wada, 656-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mersey, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislation
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 170 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruscheria, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engemann, 408 San Anselmo St., Commissioner
Joseph Frietas, Jr., 3360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Gooch, 2060 O'Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 30 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St, Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Gueriero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachnow, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Penneri, 1524 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Rymandz, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

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

DORIS M. WARD

My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor

My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Shot Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 562-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 64 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
A. Bovice, 234 Gates, Attorney
A. M. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres., Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jes T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guianaesa, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor’s Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquima Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomas N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilfirts, Minister

DAVE WHARTON

My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42


San Francisco needs a new voice.

I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.

Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I’ll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff’s Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Díaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Mortimer Fleishacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1206 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garel, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menno, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nordoza, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsay B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neport, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O’Hearn, 3539 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 380 Hill St., Government Attorney
Guyle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscape
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Supak, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment for preparation for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:

Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4602-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Brit, 4622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr, 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janel Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hgts. Blvd., Publisher
Ladie Farlan, 1322 Funston, Chair. Comm. Advis. Comt. Special Education
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzalez, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zenetti L. Goodby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Bette Lin Guimaraes, 78-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Sybil Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magallan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3352 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Moinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 435 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanic, 700-22nd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 Staten, Executive Dir.
Yuri Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA

My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOuna are:

John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3000-23rd Ave., County Central Committee
Catherine T. McCathy, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arbolino Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Tasj Eddin, 1300-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazal, 7 Lockeley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Harty, 38 Magnol Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungherr, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committee
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committee
Patricia K. Moomer, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottanaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottanaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alameda Blvd., Senior Citizen
Teresa Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committee
Michael J. DeOuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramone P. Navarro, 2107 Alameda Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Ouna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pepe, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 318-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Ouna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Ouna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator

My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:

New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent

My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for William Fel泽 are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member

John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Ross Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhoff, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician

Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barceto, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant

John P. Comisky, 1230-25th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Sup't.

Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pallis, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser

Christina Solari, 1518-36th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacko, 251 Vicentia, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant

Richard J. Tessman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Waidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zisko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist

Anita A. Flori, 1497-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1588-27th Ave., Stu. Engineer

Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Art Agnos, 617 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Briti, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agripino Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlotta Testador Del Pottillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denehy, 20B St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member

Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.

Zuretti L. Guosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader

Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lamier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature

Peter Meezy, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1325 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemerowski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney

Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors

Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official

Burl Toler, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors

Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor

My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn’t!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

The Sponsors for George L. O'Brien are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Fillert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DelPinto, 374 Ladies, Physician
Mark R. Pieckens, 146-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pin St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Connet, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
William Tomosek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroult, 152 Dividder, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dorse, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 146-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1922 Dividder, Proofreader
Francis S. Goetzl, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1335-33th Ave., Comm Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goetzl, 130 Clifford Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1315 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Pennie L. Voorhees, 823 Jones St., Student

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48

My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 3½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D.-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:

Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willy B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinni, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Mayor
Josephine E. Cole, 1596-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Gueroer St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zamore Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U., Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Parnona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenthal, 132-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 278 Eucaea St., Fund Raiser
Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiltlitas, Minister

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT R. BACCI
My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK
My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:
Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgari, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 35 Backingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Wallace G. Jelboe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-414 Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bernice S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.

M. Lester O'Shea, 3803 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1090 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2955 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Therheyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vukich, 177 San Alco Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whisman, 3061 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ellen Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agapito P. de la Torre, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1939-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 2323 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zaretti Goosey, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lerardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopn, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. II WTI
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarus, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Moe, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Joel Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terenice A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 755-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 66 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 393-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney
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ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:
Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrauk Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 550-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Philip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women’s Organization
Lula M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 316 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cnn, 259 Mission Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2301-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Heman, 635 Connecticut Street, President J.L.WU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Honigsto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Aga Jai, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Roj, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eversen Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram R. Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.
— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.
— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Fill St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O’Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1860 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cometti, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O’Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goetz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomaszek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goetz, 130 clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Pennie L. Voorhees, 823 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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CAROLE MIGDEN

My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
- to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
- to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
- to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvace, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 3026-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Brunno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agripina R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Eliazer, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Marcia L. Hunt, 146-15th Ave., Public Affairs/Information
S.F.U.S.D.

AGA JAEKS, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Armin Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margie Kaplan, 3006-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomata N. Scott, 1919 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist

Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLLEN,
M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:
George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Deerescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Sereno Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Muclachlan, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assistant
Alfred Kielwasser, 153 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 500 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 766-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cicci, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjil, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marlyn Sperber, 2665 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Tovsor, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gamon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Decerescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46

My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairman of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Benezheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobenitz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Tampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Krohenberg, 1621 Wall St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKeele Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Meadea Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilhumas, Minister

SAL ROSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager

My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 277-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward P. Callanan Jr., 162 Idera Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary J. Callanan, 1601 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 3518-39th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Foetheodore Kit, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Mahler, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.

Clintom Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margaret Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eveson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Meadea, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

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

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master’s Degree in social work. Since 1959, I’ve served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Berman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Stow Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agapito R. Cervantes, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Kawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmion, 19 Middlesfield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Publisher
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Millitas St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 51 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

quick... EXAMEN...
考 - 考

Quick! What’s a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

Answer: City Hall.

day. Apply now in Room 155
work at the polls on election day.

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA
ahora mismo.
Oficina 155 de la Academia de la Ciudad
Las elecciones. Ofrece la posibilidad de ganar
trabajo en los lugares de votación o la de

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens' complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators' salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens' complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.

— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.

— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.

— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allow a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That's just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

- Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer's authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

- For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Don't demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
— Republican Committeeman

Terence Faulkner
— BART Candidate
— Republican Committeeman

— MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A


— MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCONE MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda "Committee for Economic Democracy" proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of "fat" APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the "POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT" are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled its efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can "dream up" more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote.

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960's that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a "cure-all", but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

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

Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

**Controller’s Statement on “B”**

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

**How Supervisors Voted on “B”**

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:

**YES:** Supervisors Harry Britt, Lee Dolson, Richard Hongisto, Willie Kennedy, Quentin Kopp, John Molinari, Wendy Nelder, Louise Renne, Carol Ruth Silver, Nancy Walker and Doris Ward.

**NO:** None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

**NOTE**

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

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on "B" vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni's capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today's astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on "B" we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on "B" vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni's need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on "B" so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni's fleet.

VOTE YES ON "B".
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today's urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

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

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

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

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 88.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs... Vote Yes on C.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!
Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

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

51
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco
Endorsed by:

John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Richard D. Hongisto
Lee Dolson
Wendy Nelder
Carol Ruth Silver
Harry G. Britt
Nancy G. Walker
Willie B. Kennedy
Doris M. Ward
F. Walter Johnson

Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee’s surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee’s surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarrying (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one "provider" and one "dependent" in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition "E" are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote "YES" on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse's life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: "The costs cannot be accurately determined."

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said "Quote" "The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it's a new field. We have no actuarial data."

"We also do not know how many people the plan would affect."

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:
William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((($9,600)) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco's supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco's supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board's responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors' salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors' pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent's complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside "part-time" income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it’s the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors’ current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors’ salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco’s taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONETIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS’ SALARIES.

Michael Laderman    Nicholas Sapunar
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta    William Best
William Reed    Priscilla Scannell
San Duca    Dennis Antenore
Cynthia Land    Valerie Pope
Catherine Scanlon    Janet Wensworth
James Stark    Don Kates
William Murray    Leo Murphy
Emmet Condon    Frank Aiello
Alessandro Baccari    Victorino Herno

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

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert Galusha
Josephine B. Ramirez
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppolite
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carli
Rita Dallmott
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carey
A. J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garibaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

Argonoma Dougherty
Josefina B. Ramirez
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppolite
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carli
Rita Dallmott
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carey
A. J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garibaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

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

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor's salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

**THE PROBLEM**

- The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).
- Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.
- People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

**THE SOLUTION**

- A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.
- Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind in compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it's the responsible thing to do.

_Cyril Magnin_

---

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G**

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let's break it down:

- Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually
  11 x $9,600 = $105,600
- Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually
  11 x $23,582 = $259,402
- Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per month — $21,450 annually
  11 x $21,450 = $235,950

Total $600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

_VOTE NO ON “G”_

_Edna Mae Martin_

Senior Citizen

---

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G**

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote "NO"!!!

---

**ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G**

BART Board Candidate _Bob Geary_ (Democratic Committeeman)
Former City Commissioner _Terence Faulkner_

---

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors' pay to 25% of the Mayor's salary): "The City is facing a dire financial crisis . . . Proposition J . . . is the wrong idea at the wrong time."

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate _Robert Silvestri_ (Republican Committeeman)
— _Terence Faulkner_ (Republican Committeeman)

_Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency._
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller's Statement on "H"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:

NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 62
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide "Fixed" employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on "age at entry" into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on "age at entry" is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a "fixed" rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, "age at entry" rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City's rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years' cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers' Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARter AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

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

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration, (Continued on page 90)
PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller's Statement on "I"

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

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by
a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/
disability benefits for police officers hired after that
date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the depart-
tment today receive substantially lower benefits than
their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were es-
established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil
Service Commission and the San Francisco Police
Department pertaining to women and minorities.
Goals were established to insure their fair represen-
tation within the department. It is precisely these people
however, who have been adversely affected by the
reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently
signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on
the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the
inequity of having two officers who perform the same
difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at
two substantially different levels. In addition, it would
rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits
currently being offered for those who die in the line
of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police
officers to the same level of disability and retirement
benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We
now have two disability and retirement systems for
the Police Department — one being substantially in-
ferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers
perform the same duties under the same difficult cir-
cumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system,
providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the fu-
ture of the San Francisco Police Department. As your
Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the
areas of equality for every person. Most people are
unaware of the division within the ranks of the San
Francisco Police Department. The department is now
recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as
new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not affor-
ded the same retirement protections, or disability
benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers.
This is not fair as they are providing us with the
same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When
Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just sys-
tem of retirement and disability within our police
department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

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

LOOKING FOR WORK?
LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO?
¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el dia de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldia de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

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

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot
On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 39
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PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE
Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

·San Francisco Police Officers Association

Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

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

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD
DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.

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

第一章：工作良機

你可以在十一月二日三藩市選舉日工作，特別歡迎雙語言人士應聘，在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票。請往市政廳（潤街交高街）一五五室申請。
Electric Utility Ownership

PROPOSITION K
Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller’s Statement on “K”

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

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF “K” — SEE PAGE 99
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Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E’s Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you’re right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 “public power” cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn’t pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city’s hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy’s cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go “public power”. And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

Palo Alto (public) $11.06
Redding (public) $12.35
Santa Clara (public) $14.50

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Agner
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borice
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lulu Carter
Manuel Ceballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Conny Ford

Eulilio Frausto
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zuretti Grooby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallman
Sue Heston
Joe Hughes
Esplanada Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
David Looman

Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shaskin
Stanley Shields
Janet Shoch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Sterne
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventura
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caren Wyland

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

PG&É claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&É's electric facilities at about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Norcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”)

Oh brother. If you think PG&É is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we'd have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore, we'd be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can't. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930's, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON "K"

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That's why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city's utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It's a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

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

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Type</th>
<th>Amount (Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco’s continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That “somewhere” is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another “feasibility study” but we will have thrown our City’s hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn’t mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital “lifeline” service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don’t sacrifice our City’s future on the flawed altar of “municipal ownership.” We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers’ money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

* Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner’s property (as much as $15 million).
* Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).
* Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.
* At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).
* A huge new City administrative staff.
* Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn’t require a “feasibility study” that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers’ money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Strattoon
Preston Creek
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Reduction Committeeman)
Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller's Statement on "L"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:
Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco's world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltsugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The "Can't use the side door" fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient "off-street" access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!
Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on "symbolism" to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, "costs be damned" career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to "butcher" the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn't enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

W. F. O'Keefe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls...

A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition “L” denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years, architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition “L” would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition “L” is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on “L” for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamonte, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leah, Mayor’s Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Westia Whitfield
Lucille Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanagh
Cindy Koh, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodelaw
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sadovia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKeel Murphy
Kathleen Lanham, Gray Panthers
Tom Wolfred, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatrical Rhinoceros
Dmitri Belier
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilton, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Berman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rutberg

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

Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

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

OOPS!

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

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

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller's Statement on “M”

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

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samarzis, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Harderman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco's housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project's site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O'Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O'Connell
William Sepatidis
David Finn
Sylvia Durrance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez

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

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER
SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery

E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery

Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery

Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology

Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Brectil, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine

Devon Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology

Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology

Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology

Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology

Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery

William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery

Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research

Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry

Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology

Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine

Howard Shapiro, M. D.

Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology

John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology

Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology

Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman

Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M.

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

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

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

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Souls
Gene Pratt
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:

VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P., in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardis Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

John Bardis
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Bardis
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California
Hotel at Carl & Hillway Sts.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIous TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed “medically oriented” use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other “ancillary commercial areas” in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote “NO” on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote “NO” on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

lot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgements of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

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

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider’s Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Bragman
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Mile Cucek
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennis
Dr. Richard Dennis
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadja Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don’t let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park’s skyline. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committee)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by *(double parenthesis)*.

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

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

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by sections 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall (in amount not to) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require: (2) for repairs and maintenance: (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described: (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions: (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937–1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable

useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)
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7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
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8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System(1), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. *(End)*

---
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8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Any allowance heretofore terminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. *(End)*
the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” and “death benefit.”

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

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms “miscellaneous officer or employee,” or “member,” as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees’ Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

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

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

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

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not 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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 earned by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(D) 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 benefit 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 subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) 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
(Proposition H, Continued)

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 reposit 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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

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

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

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

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

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

(H) 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 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 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 amount of 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuaries who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the propositions therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(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 on 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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

**TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION I**

**NOTE:** All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

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

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member by Act of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, with deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

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

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age more or less than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or who, with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1.

Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he were retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such deceased member if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the 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 spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 marriage, to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based: provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:

(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from the status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, due to any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7 ½%) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590.

Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be at the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, or at the later date of a periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 or death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodic actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valua-
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tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under Section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member’s individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, in so far as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section.

In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code, and/or any other disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year. A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided, however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

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

8.451 Police Department

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco: That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county," the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francis-

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted in time of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment District." In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort and convenience of the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:

That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL 1:

Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of said lot 45; running thence easterly along said southerly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 32,664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right

and running westerly 35,807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2:

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35,808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 3:

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence
at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:

PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running westerly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 8:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:

Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTERAS DE IMPRENTA

Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT.
Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

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

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

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

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

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

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

Mail to:
ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, October 25, 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.
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### Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Vote</th>
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</tr>
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<td>Businessman/Comerciente</td>
<td>7</td>
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<table>
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</tr>
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<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>17</td>
</tr>
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</table>
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<td>California State Senator/Legislator del Estado de California</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BURGER, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
<td>26</td>
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
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<tr>
<td>MARY GINCELL</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM</td>
<td>American Independent</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>畢洱 畢洱ist</td>
<td>律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<table>
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<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>鋼鐵工人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>企業財務人員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>州司庫</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>審定公共會計師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attorney General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>民事自由律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>勞工律師</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>資深副司法廳長</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>洛杉磯郡地方檢察官</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>民事自由律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>勞工律師</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>資深副司法廳長</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>洛杉磯郡地方檢察官</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member, State Board of Equalization—1st District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Board of Education, Appointed Member, 1st District/Dirigente del Distrito de la Educación, Nombrado, 1er distrito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NYGREN</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. “BILL” IVERS</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisrador del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS</td>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education, Appointed Member, 1st District/Dirigente del Distrito de la Educación, Nombrado, 1er distrito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>商人／反稅收倡議人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>加州立法員</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>稅收改革倡議人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON, Republican</td>
<td>Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>Governor of California/Gobernador de California</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA &quot;TEN&quot; DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td>Printer/Impresor</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Representative in Congress—6th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD C. CREIGHTON, Libertarian</td>
<td>Mortgage Banker/Banquero Hipotecario</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY-ALLEN ALBERTSON, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Law Clerk/Clergyman/Empleado de Oficina Juridica/Clérigo</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS MCQUAD, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BOXER, Democratic</td>
<td>County Supervisor/Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Member of the Assembly—17th Assembly District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly/Orador Asambleista de California</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS S. CRARY, Republican</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL G. ZAHAKIS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Community Worker/Minister/Trabajador de la Comunidad/Clérigo</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Abortion Rights Activist/Activista a Favor del Derecho al Aborto</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank K. Richardson</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto M. Kaus</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen E. Broussard</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz Reynoso</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Racanelli</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph H. Grodin</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Miller</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome A. Smith</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Wayne White</td>
<td>Shall he be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Periodo de servicio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal</td>
<td>Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación, División Tres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Shall BETTY BARRY-DEAL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | 应否在法律指任之任 嘉成 YES/SI 105  
反對 NO 106 |
| ¿Deberá BETTY BARRY-DEAL ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? | 期内選任本公職？ 反對 |
| Shall WINSLOW CHRISTIAN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | 应否在法律指任之任 嘉成 YES/SI 108  
反對 NO 109 |
| ¿Deberá WINSLOW CHRISTIAN ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? | 期内選任本公職？ 反對 |
| Shall MARC POCHÉ be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law? | 应否在法律指任之任 嘉成 YES/SI 111  
反對 NO 112 |
| ¿Deberá MARC POCHÉ ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley? | 期内選任本公職？ 反對 |

### Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1</th>
<th>地方裁判法院，第一席</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY  
Attorney/Abogada | 律師 116  
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal |
| ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI  
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal | 助理地方檢察官 117  
地方裁判法院，第一席 |
**Superintendent of Public Instruction**  
Superintendente de Instrucción Pública  
Vote for One  
Vote por Uno  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District/State Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Honig</td>
<td>District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Riles</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente Estadal de Instrucción Pública</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member, Board of Education**  
Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco  
Vote for no more than Three  
Vote por no más de Tres  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Felzer</td>
<td>Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. O'Brien</td>
<td>Free School - Economics Instructor/Escolar Libre - Instructor de Economía</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Crichton De Osuna</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Kopf</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodonia M. Wilson</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario Anaya</td>
<td>President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member, Community College Board**  
Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad de San Francisco  
Vote for no more than Three  
Vote por no más de Tres  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Bacci</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael S. Bernick</td>
<td>Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Da Prato</td>
<td>Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland Moglen</td>
<td>Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan S. Wong</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Roselli</td>
<td>Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Riordan</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchandiser/Bible Preacher/Comerciente/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McCAMON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. &quot;BELLE STARR&quot; MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultor</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUIER</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE SCHOOL BUILDING LEASE-PURCHASE BOND LAW OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools. FOR 186 → AGAINST 187 →

COUNTY JAIL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BOND ACT OF 1981. This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000. FOR 190 → AGAINST 191 →

VETERANS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans. FOR 194 → AGAINST 195 →

LAKE TAHOE ACQUISITIONS BOND ACT. This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $89,000,000. FOR 198 → AGAINST 199 →

FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS BOND ACT OF 1982. This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing. FOR 202 → AGAINST 203 →

PUBLIC PENSION FUND INVESTMENT. Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds. YES 206 → NO 207 →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Núm.</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Información Adicional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>Estatal de Bonos de Compra-Arriendo para la construcción de escuelas de 1982.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolsos de capital para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos de Desembolso de Capital para Carcel de Condado de 1981.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y reparación de cárcel de condado y ejecución de mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos de Veteranos de 1982.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos de Adquisiciones de Lake Tahoe, Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Cuenca de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar los valores pintorescos y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es $85,000,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>Acta de Bonos de Compradores de Casas por Primera Vez de 1982.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>Inversión de fondos de pensiones públicos.</td>
<td>Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos proscriptos de acciones comunes. Prescribir normas de liquidación fiduciaria. Impacto fiscal: De ponerse en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañados por riesgo mayor para los fondos participantes, lo cual podría acarrear pérdidas capitales para los fondos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

7

TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from “newly constructed” definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

YES 211 ➔
NO 212 ➔

8

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing “taxes” to anticipated “revenues”. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

YES 215 ➔
NO 216 ➔

9

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

YES 220 ➔
NO 221 ➔

10

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

YES 225 ➔
NO 226 ➔

11

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 229 ➔
NO 230 ➔

12

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

YES 233 ➔
NO 234 ➔
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
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8


9

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR GOBIERNOS LOCALES PARA MANTENIMIENTO. Cambia las bases de límite y pago provenientes de "impuestos" acumulados a "rechos" esperados. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impacto fiscal indirecto: Ningún impacto fiscal indirecto. Al instrumentarse, el análisis del analista podría reducir el costo de interés de la agencia que recibe al préstamo y, conversamente, reducir el interés que normalmente hubiera sido gasto de otra manera por agencias que no reciben préstamos.

10

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo un voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Impacto fiscal indirecto: Ningún impacto fiscal indirecto. Al instrumentarse, costos aumentados de salario y jubilación para el estado y/o los condados para los jueces elevados, y costos administrativos desconocidos a ochos, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

11

RECIPIENTES DE BEBIDAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de reembolso de cinco centavos o más y debe ser pagado al devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto neto fiscal. Podrían resultar reducciones de costos por limpieza de basura y desecho de desperdicios sólidos y un aumento o disminución de cantidad desconocida en colecciones de rechos de impuestos. Ver el análisis del analista para explicación de las variables.

12

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador le escriba al Presidente para urgirlo que proponga a la Unión Soviética un alto en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 5 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

REAPPORPTION COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249 →
NO 250 →

B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 3/4 of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256 →
NO 257 →

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

YES 259 →
NO 260 →
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
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RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agrega estatuos con respecto a programas de conservación de agua, permite asignaciones para aguas fluviales, usos del Río Sanitarios y reglamentación del consumo excesivo de aguas freáticas. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $148 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hídricos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de litigation; pérdida desconocida de ríos de aporte eléctrico y ahorros desconocidos de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adquisición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.

237 SI 贊成
238 NO 反對

COMISION DE NUEVO PRORROGADO. Abre el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo prorroga y establece una comisión de evaluación. Prohibe la prolongación de distritos legislativos y de igualización empezando con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en presunciones del Analista, habrá un aumento para el censo de $25,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable una vez cada 10 años empezando en 1991.

241 SI 贊成
242 NO 反對

ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidos en el Estado. Prohibe la prescripción legislativa absoluta de la posesión de armas de fuego. Impacto fiscal: Impacto Imposible de determinar. Aumentaría el costo administrativo redoblando la inhibición de mantenimiento del sistema de justicia criminal. Podría afectar los ríos de impuestos a la venta y la renta. Vea el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los variables.

245 SI 贊成
246 NO 反對

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

249 SI 贊成
250 NO 反對 ¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre mala conducta de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

252 SI 贊成
253 NO 反對 ¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, excluirse de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capital no deberán exceder 1% de la compra de $100 de ventas de propiedades tazadas y del requerimiento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

256 SI 贊成
257 NO 反對 ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarlas para adquirir partes particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufacture, investigación y otros, con reembolsos por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda o obligación sobre la Ciudad?

259 SI 贊成
260 NO 反對 ¿Debe la ciudad subscribirse a los convenios sobre vivienda de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subscribió a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Salud?

266 SI 贊成
267 NO 反對 ¿Debe la ciudad subscribirse a los convenios sobre vivienda de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subscribió a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Salud?

268 SI 贊成
269 NO 反對 ¿Debe la ciudad subscribirse a los convenios sobre vivienda de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subscribió a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Salud?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對 ¿Debe la ciudad subscribirse a los convenios sobre vivienda de los empleados activos o jubilados en la misma forma en que la ciudad subscribió a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Salud?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Proposition F has been removed by the Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 71/2% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

E ¿Se deberá permitir el cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

263 SI 贊成
264 NO 反對

F 広報図書館建立の提案

267 SI 贊成
268 NO 反對

G ¿Deberá pagarse a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

H ¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados militares de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse al 7 1/2 % de la compensación de esos empleados?

273 SI 贊成
274 NO 反對

I ¿Deberá crearse un nuevo Plan de Jubilación o Inapropiación para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1 de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

J ¿Deberá pagarse a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberán darse tiempos libres del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajar en días festivos, según lo solicite el oficial?

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

K ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada tiempo de completarse el estudio?

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

L ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco no construir rampas de acceso en la entrada a City Hall, bien sea la ubicada en la Calle Polk o la ubicada en Avenida Van Ness?

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

M ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco afectar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificando the propiedad para su ubicación?

退休制度内的成员的未亡配偶，目前可享受支领退休金，如果他们在60岁后结婚，是否仍继续享受退休金？
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:

#16—Area East of __________ (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN __________ (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of __________ (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:

#3—Area NORTH of __________ (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of __________ (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:

#5—All the UNSHADED area __________
#6—All the SHADED area __________

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q.—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A.—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3).

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

Q.—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A.—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
     State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
     State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
     United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

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

Q.—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A.—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q.—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A.—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q.—When do I vote?
A.—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q.—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A.—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
   • mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters' handbook.

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

Q.—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A.—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q.—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A.—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off at the beginning or end of your working day.

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

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

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

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

Q.—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A.—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

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

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

Q.—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A.—Yes. This is called a "write-in." If you want to and don't know whom, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

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

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

**ABSENTEE BALLOT** — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

**BALLOT** — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

**BONDS OR NOTES** — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

**BUDGET** — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

**CAPITAL COSTS** — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

**INITIATIVE** — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

**MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES** — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

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

**PROPOSITION** — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

**POLLING PLACE** — The place where you go to vote.

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

**SUPERVISORS** — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

**RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER**

14234. Assistance to voter.

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

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

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

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney
My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius' (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Boroldingen, Dominique Olcomendy, Albert Wellenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lilian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Morgan Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

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

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


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

E. Patricia Lacey

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim. — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART's current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:

— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.

— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.

— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: “The people don’t care.”

— “Do-Nothing”. Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.

— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).

— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.

— Silvestri favors police “decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.

— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who’s Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.

— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.

— For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Pérón, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christian H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dillettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Proletarian
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakes, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1350 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32

Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-2nd St., Carpenter
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1535-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Costak, 2655 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Eliot, 733-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloa M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen G. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Ernie Gooby, 753 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikem via, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangle, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 35-55 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thompson, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate.

Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrak, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotheodore Kiff, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margaret Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Dalley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Janc McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
F. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukisch, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilritas, Minister
DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36


Diana Coleman

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacquelyne E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Cosak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Erie Gossby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Wehe, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 353-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist

My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality . . . safer neighborhoods . . . stronger rent control . . . affordable housing . . . control downtown growth . . . employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Maisumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randi Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Streicher, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive
Vaughn Taylor, 3623-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board

* Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JERRY R. De YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1828-18th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundal, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilacion, 88 Watervile St., Distribution Att’d Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst./Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Slumbersky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 131 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat. Typist
Harold Weibecker, 42 Sunner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2111-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors


Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond I. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Breshears, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cady, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Coorrad, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rosi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Teasdale Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McAtee, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samarzis, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Senion, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.
My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.
I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.
Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.
Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.
All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.
Martin Eng can win!

KENNETH L. FARMER
My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Belleiveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jarett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irma Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliott, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornbluth, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mg., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Ptich, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:
Ted Akmes, 1882 Green St., Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beekley, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2262-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1122 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pine St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkby, 41 Rudder Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molina, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Peters, 663 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1761 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strauss, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Rabin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Young, 989 Fillbert St., System Engineer

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

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.  

Richard D. Hongisto

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55
My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.  

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinskey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmenci L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-34th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 385 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Dieter.
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Priest St., Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachelle Cottonreader, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lisa Triff Belli, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Berstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businesman
Al Borove, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agripina R. Cerbastos, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cunco, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Bellsie Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Dorin J. Hitchen, 417-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women

Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library
Commission.
Leroy King, 730 W. Lane, Regional Director, I.E. W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William J. Leong, 1407-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madson, 1530 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kim Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pitcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Theimi Shelley, 70 Everson, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 585-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurantante
Lenore Cautrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christiane M. Bergess, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Bersten, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Papadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eienberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paup, 1406 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tina Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roché, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo
My occupation is Urban Planner.
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Ahonen, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Bealston, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blythen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Faeher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Gumeret, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalmian, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. LaDuca, 418A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schleiman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 11888 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 580 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wilsey, 417 Stockton, Messenger
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California's major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Curriaran, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forslund, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Horn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Fae Melanieh, 125 Inaunin Way, Retired
Joseph L. Mistanza, 2323 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullen, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palace, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapiro, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1503-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Roberta Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shrader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Britl, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Laborer's Union
George Fosd, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 633 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member,
Nat'l Women's Political Caucus
John L. Medinari, 1222 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer's Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kincho Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

K. F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.

I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley “Belle Starr”

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Amerie Azvedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Baiderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Mebane F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Dubum, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Locksley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 83 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 995 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alannah Hartzok, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hirabayashi, 337 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lottie K. Imagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahourieh, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrofani, 4020-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilheim, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burks, 1725-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loiret L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Ciree Forrest, 40 Langston St., Accountant
Paula “Ralf” Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pilhan, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 42 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 Sun Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen's Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:
- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable.
- Creating needed services for seniors.
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
- Assuring healthy drinking water.
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Fulton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonecrest Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbano Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 154-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard "Lefty" Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohelan Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization
Thomas C. Seaton, 631 Vickie, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Beleher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It's time for a change!

Robert Squeri

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:
Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Bocchetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOsame, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Fairbell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gilbergay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 272 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filliart, Title Searcher
Lucile Jane, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Maggie Kehoe, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaFanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardin McCain, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1927-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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OLGA TALAMANTE
My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO
My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:
Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Goselin, 18928 Market St.
Karen Hudburgh, 27216 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 350 Franciscan, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004 3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 329A Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Purell, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabish, 2, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emett Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldamando, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brussels, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 1288-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1509 Shadrack, Nuc. Disarm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 223 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:
Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC
AFL-CIO
Gloria A. Austin, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR
Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Elhew W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 682 Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanagh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latino, 1910 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4103

Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffer’s Union
Local 265

Laura L. Loui, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgina Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38

John Viberg, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56

My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city's communities, leaders and constituencies.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:

John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 820-46th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 1Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jacks, 62 Woodland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 495 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denebeim, 200 S. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President I.L.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Barlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geyser, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Doi, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 556-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezy, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John W. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Philip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California
Legislature
John W. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 39 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Al Bovisce, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanyan St., Commissioner
Joseph Frietas, Jr., 3300 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Losi J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave, Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 200 O'Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocaan, Public Relations
Kay Pachtner, 155 Viveberg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestri, 1324 Clayton St., Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Blund Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 South Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 5622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 3222 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessy, 1401 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Bovisce, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lanado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimarães, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor’s Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Aagar Jacobs, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomata N. Scott, 1912½ Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yor Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliaritas, Minister

DAVE WHARTON
My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42
San Francisco needs a new voice.
I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.
Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I’ll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St, Sheriff’s Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bake Jr., 980 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Moritz Fleischman 1013 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garell, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Miconi, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morton, 2758-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Norden, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assst., City of S.F.
Ramsay B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Nielson, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O’Hearn, 359 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Reafray, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Ernest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Slupski, 308 Maple, Business Execuitive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16St, Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr. 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agrupino R. Cerbato, 6o Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellanonicia, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers
Assoc.
Jess T. Estova, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimares, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Juinito Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanie, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Tom, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA
My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government’s Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:
John J. Barbagaletu, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCathy, 93 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arbolito Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taqi-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorigi, 766 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkurt, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Moore, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecila Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Alemany Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulknner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon P. Navarro, 2107 Alemany Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pettit, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 318-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:
New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

MYRA KOPF
My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lacey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Ross Crabbe, 1500 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betsy J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Pacegrella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1063 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2010-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Baroco, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Sup't.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40 Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Paltt, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacke, 251 Vicent, Accountant
S. J. Swanston, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tessman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Woldy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zifko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Orlean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agrinipo Cerbaotu, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 1093 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Tidler Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zurelli L. Goosby, 1030 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Huish, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St, Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinaro, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mor, 487-49th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemoverkiy, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4202-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Bur Toler, 581 Grizzly, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris W. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don't want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.
People will control education when government doesn't!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for George O'Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Gurriss, 44 Prospect Ave., Manjusha/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DePrato, 374 Laidley, Physican
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Rainnond, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Moyakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard
President
Kathleen O'Shea, 334-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Deni M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems
Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroult, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems
Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie B. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 490 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Emest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President College Community Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers' Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack, Planning Commissioner
Ammos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Josephine E. Cole, 1598-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Floyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov't. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 520-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.L.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McCaskey Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. O Yue, 877-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Eloise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilititus, Minister

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:

Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgalt, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes L. Chan, 10 Milller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1909 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dangwall, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galli, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Charch Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3550 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Huse, 340 San Benito, Executive
Waller G. Jex, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jeffers, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert 0. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association
President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Cressatle Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terheden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vulsich, 177 San Alayo Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whitman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Verba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shaftier, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agrinino R. Cerbato, 60 Gough Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 223-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Covalin, 1599-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dure, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Wasington Center
Zaretti Groosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Habred, 1308 Montgomery Business Person
Lacrado Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopf, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 7535 Santa Cruz, Regional Dir. ILWU
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 768-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lurzaztis, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Maks, 123 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Poirier, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Issodore Pivnick, 2520 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymund, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randi Stalling, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney

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

39
CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4602-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shafter Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women's Organization
Lula M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Tognia, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Debold, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 355 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. College Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President ILWU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Agar Joaies, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Medipari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 20 Everston Street, Assistant Director
Arlt Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Monticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

Robert E. Burton

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Fillbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O'Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1050 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1581 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goeitz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Coughman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Doney, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goeditz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Modler, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications systems Consultant
Rühart Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Penne L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Robert A. Da Prato
CAROLE MIGDEN
My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
— to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
— to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
— to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borie, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Bruno, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agnipino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebeim, 200 S. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
Sam Ducan, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Elsner, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Agar Jacks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Amstein Jenkins, 450 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Alvert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomatia N. Scott, 1916 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Watters, 188 Eureka St., Trustee
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLIN,
M.S.; J.D.
My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:

George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Deescenzeno, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Filiomre St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher McChluskian, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kiewasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kainy, 760-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Protcor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjil, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilyn Sperber, 2065 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Toreira, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gannon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Deescenzeno, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elisabeth Liu, 689 Lombard, Pharmacist
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

SAL ROSSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager
My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli
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ALAN S. WONG
My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Shattuck Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agapito R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 620-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hopp, 55 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hopp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
William C. Kennedy, 1340 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired
John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmom, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yuri Wada, 565-8th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirias St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold F. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER:
City Hall
Work at the polls on election day. Apply now in Room 155.

RAPIDO! Cual es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA
ahora mismo
Oficina 155 de la Alcaldia de la Ciudad?
las elecciones, dieran una localidad en la tabla en los lugares de votacion el dia de

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A

Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen's Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller's Statement on "A"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints' approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on "A"

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens' complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators' salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens' complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.
— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.
— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.
— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That's just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

 Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

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

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.’s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.’s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department’s disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer’s authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A


— MOSCON MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCON MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri.
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don’t demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate (Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

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

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda “Committee for Economic Democracy” proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of “fat” APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the “POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT” are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it’s efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can “dream up” more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

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

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960’s that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a “cure-all”, but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

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

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

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller’s Statement on “B”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni's capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today's urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

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

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52.

Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION C
Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on “C”
On August 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today’s high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs... Vote Yes on C.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!
Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

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

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

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

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

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

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

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

Controller's Statement on "D"

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

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

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

 NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco
Endorsed by:
John L. Molinari, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, Board of Supervisors
Richard D. Hongisto, Board of Supervisors
Lee Dolton, Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nolder, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Britt, Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker, Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, Board of Supervisors
F. Walter Johnson, Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charté Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category "Surviving Spouse" in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a "YES" vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

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

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

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

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City em-
ployee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on "E"

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

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

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.
Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!
Vote yes on E.
Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one “provider” and one “dependent” in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition “E” are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.
Vote “YES” on Proposition E.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse’s life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: “The costs cannot be accurately determined.”

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said “Quote” “The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it’s a new field. We have no actuarial data.”

“We also do not know how many people the plan would affect.”

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:
William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE

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

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

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

2.100 Composition and Salary

The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ($9,600) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco's supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco's supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board's responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors' salaries to $23,924:

— This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

— This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors' pay in the other Bay Area counties.

— This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

— This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it's the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors' current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere "token."

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors' salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco's taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON "G"

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS' SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Stanlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmet Condon
Alessandro Baccari

Nicholas Sagar
William Bost
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Artenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermosita
Willis Hannawalt

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

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors' pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can't. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don't have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON "G".

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Fellhauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Suzzi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Aloysia J. Smyth
Joan Willemen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emelyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry Jobe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Grath

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Besee Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farbstein
John and Madeline Sherin
William and Irene Keaning
Joseph and Agnes Mibaches
Dorothy Nissley
Caroline Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramus
Mohamed and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogleberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carli
Rita Dallmann
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephan Garbaldt
Helen Vargas
Frank Laney
Laura Moffit
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Marsel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Pasen
Enola Maxwell
Hal Cream
Walter G. Jobe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerald Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Luebello
Veronica Murray
Helen Neeby
Frances Condron
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Boll
Walter and Kathleen Glynn
Walter and Fern Floying
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Bob Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Loma Pollett
William McGrath

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

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor’s salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

• The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

• Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

• People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

• A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

• Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it’s the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let’s break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually 11 x $9,600 $105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per month — $21,450 annually times 11 235,950

Total $600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committee)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote “NO”!!!

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors’ pay to 25% of the Mayor’s salary): “The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time.”

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
(Republican Committee)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committee)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
“Miscellaneous” Employees’ Retirement

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City’s Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee’s contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City’s Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

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

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
“Miscellaneous” Employees’ Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide “Fixed” employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on “age at entry” into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on “age at entry” is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a “fixed” rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, “age at entry” rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City’s rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years’ cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers’ Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration.

(Continued on page 90)
Police Retirement

PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. L.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two, disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition L will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committee)

Democratic Committee member Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committee member Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!
Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller’s Statement on “J”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE
Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay sworn officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well-trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J
Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote "YES"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

CAPITULO I. OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabajará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral. Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.

第一章：工作良機

你可以一十一月三日，瀋市選舉日工作，特別歡迎雙語人士應聘。在你鄰近投票站協助選民投票，請往市政廳（潤街與高街）一五四室申請。
Electric Utility Ownership

PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition, this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E’s Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you’re right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 “public power” cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn’t pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city’s hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy’s cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go “public power”. And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto (public)</td>
<td>$11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding (public)</td>
<td>$12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara (public)</td>
<td>$14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Baker
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borvice
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lula Carter
Manuel Ceballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Conny Ford
Eulalia Frausto
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
David Goldstein
Bob Graham
Marian Heath
Raul Hernandez
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallinan
Sue Hestor
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judy Kaplan
Allison Brennan Kwaskin
David Looman
Thomas McCarthy
Leone Uriarte Monterey
Ann Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Franciscoan Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shaskan
Stanley Shields
James Sloch
Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caran Wylana

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E’s electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Electricity
Economist

Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics

John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist

Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist

Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neitlands, Ph.D.
Professor

Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(Democratic Committeeman)
Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON “K”

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.’s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we’d have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we’d be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930’s, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON “K”

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY P.G.&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco’s continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That “somewhere” is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another “feasibility study” but we will have thrown our City’s hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn’t mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital “lifeline” service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don’t sacrifice our City’s future on the flawed altar of “municipal ownership.” We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245
Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers’ money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner’s property (as much as $15 million).

*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million a year.

*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).

*A huge new City administrative staff.

*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn’t require a “feasibility study” that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers’ money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”
Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)

Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
City Hall Ramps

PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller’s Statement on “L”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:
Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.
Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.
A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco's world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The "Can't use the side door" fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an asymmetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient "off-street" access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on "symbolism" to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractable, "costs be damned" career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to "butcher" the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn't enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

W. F. O'Keefe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000, (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls . . . a national landmark.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition "L" denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition "L" would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition "L" is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on "L" for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forseg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamante, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor's Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Westla Whitfield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SF State
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodenow
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Solonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKeown Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Grey Panthers
Tim Wolford, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatres Rhinoceros
Dimitri Belser
Pat Christian
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Phillip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rubberg
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your "NO" vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by the Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeeman)
Artie Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it's possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under "Official Advertising" or "Legal Notices")
PROPOSITION M

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant
Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madeyln Samarzis, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco’s housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project’s site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Teggle
J. E. O’Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O’Connell
William Seputtitis
David Finn
Sylvia Durance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devron Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco's taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco’s housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn  
Guy Cherney  
Ted Souls  
Gene Prat  
William Conroy  
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL: VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and from transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco’s tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P., in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.  
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bardis Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

John Bardis
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California
VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straight forward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed "medically oriented" use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other "ancillary commercial areas" in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote "NO" on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote "NO" on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco Civic Associations
SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITON FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

Nicholas L. Petakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock  Ellen Huppert
Dr. Robert Brigante  Peter Huppert
Dr. Kenneth Brown  Dr. Lester Jacobson
Dr. Francis Chamberlain  Paul Johnson
Dr. Joan Cucek  Jackie Lalanne
Mile Cucek  Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Mary Dalman  Dr. Matthew LaVail
Dr. Peter Dalman  Margaret Northcott
Norma Dennes  Kenny O'Hara
Dr. Richard Dennes  Alvin Pelavin
Dr. Roberta Fenlon  Marion Robertson
Jean Ferdinandsen  Burton Rockwell
Nan Freitas  Nicky Salan
Ano Gillam  Dr. Donald Sander
Harold Gillam  Mary Sander
Dr. Sadja Greenwood  Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Richard Harrington  Suzanne Skolnikoff
Granger Hill

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-spectulator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote "NO"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeeman)
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by **bold face type**; deletions are indicated by `((double parenthesis)).`

**3.530 Police Department**

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legislatively appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

**3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints**

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department Internal Affairs Bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION B**

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall (in amount not to) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described; (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions: (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, determine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $0.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)
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7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
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8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. Any person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System(()), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purpose, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district, and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of “the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district, and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to the average contribution,” as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in Section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with Sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the fund of the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition hereof submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

If in the election of November 2, 1982, two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section.(End)
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8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years, and further provided that the provisions of this section shall be applicable only to the first such marriage.

Any allowance heretofore terminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)
TEXT OF PROPOSITION H
(Continued from page 70)

the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.7250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.7750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
</tr>
<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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
revocation, to withdraw his accumulated contributions, said election to be exercised in writing on a form furnished by the retirement system and filed at the office of said system and a member so electing shall be considered as having terminated his membership in said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by any 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 benefit 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 subsection (b) of this section, and has designed 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 children or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) If the person last entitled to said allowance is the remarried surviving spouse of such member, to such spouse.

(b) Otherwise, to the surviving children of the member, share and share alike, or if there are no such children, to the estate of the person last entitled to said allowance.

The surviving spouse may elect, on a form provided by the retirement system and filed in the office of the retirement system before the first payment of the allowance provided herein, to receive the benefit provided in subdivision (1) of this subsection in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be payable under the provisions of this subdivision. If a surviving
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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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1% percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

(1) Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

(2) Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.

(H) 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 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 manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contributions 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 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.]

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuaries, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the results 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 July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(I) Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in subsection (B) 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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an 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 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION I

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Sections 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter; notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

“Retirement allowance,” “death allowance” or “allowance,” shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, or upon the day following the date of death, as the case may be, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

“Compensation earnable” shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member been entitled to the provisions of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

“Compensation earnable” shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

“Benefit” shall include “allowance,” “retirement allowance,” “death allowance” and “death benefit.”

“Final compensation” shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms “member of the police department,” “member of the department,” or “member” shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

“Retirement system” or “system” shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

“Retirement Board” shall mean “retirement board” as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to the portion of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The question of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's initiative, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 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 marriage, to his surviving spouse, or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of injury or onset of the illness which results in death if he had retired, or remarried to the member at least one year prior to his death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, "surviving spouse" shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. "Qualified for service retirement," "Qualification for service retirement" or "qualified to receive and serve" as used in this section and other sections to which persons who are members under section 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

In computing a member's retirement allowance, any portion of any retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.
(Proposition I, Continued)

city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction of and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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 the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redepoded upon reentry into service:

1. Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

2. Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.

3. Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

1. There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½%) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

2. The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide part of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation of the experience under the system, of the benefits therefrom to be paid to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest therefrom, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on said respective dates of salaries therefrom 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 valua-
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...tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might accrue to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer become effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from elective to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it shall conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section.

In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said section shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
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NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word "member" or "members" as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgement of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgement of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half ((in the judgment of the police commission)) as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county," the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco, which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary
for conversion of such a system from municipal own-
ership to consumer ownership; and examination of
models of governance and management for such a
public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study
should also consider the alternative of a system which
provides electricity to the residential and industrial
sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than
to that portion of the city and county within the area
commonly known as the “Downtown Assessment Dis-
trict.” In addition to examining alternatives, the con-
tractor shall make recommendations from among the
alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency
and such other criteria as may be suggested by the
Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of
Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned
in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of pas-
sage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall
authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility
study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and de-
termination of a contractor shall be made by the
Public Utilities Commission after public hearings con-
cerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out
the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of
this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall author-
ize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of
funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as
may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that
such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of
the Department, but instead be taken from revenues
normally available for funding of studies by the
Department. The contractor for such study shall be
directed to complete and present the study to the
Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10,
1984.

3. That, following submission of the completed fea-
sibility study to the city and county by the contractor,
the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of
acquisition, including condemnation of property and
bond authorization, before the people at the general
election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any rea-
son be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance
shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full
force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordi-
nance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent
the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for
above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:
It shall be the policy of the City and County of
San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the
public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general
welfare and to protect the character and stability of
the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex
and the University of California Medical Center, and
to promote the orderly and beneficial development of
such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions and all
other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate
zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for
guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or
more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaur-
ant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and
other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty
housing units which can be sold at a fair market
price or rented at a fair rental market price. Further-
more, there shall be provisions for off-street parking
spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five
automobiles.
The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an
area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical com-
plex and medical center, which area is specifically
described as follows:
That certain real property situated in the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
scribed as follows:
PARCEL 1:
Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon “Map of
PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California,”
filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in
the office of the Recorder of the City and County of
San Francisco, State of California, described as fol-
lows:
BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the
southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of
said lot 45; running thence easterly along said sou-
therly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting
95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel
with the westerly line of said lot 45, a distance of
32,664 feet, thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right
100
and running westerly 35,807 feet to the westerly line
of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the
right and running northerly along said westerly line
of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point
of beginning.
PARCEL 2:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon
“Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
scribed as a whole as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence
southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 30,234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to
the left and running northerly 35,808 feet; thence
deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly
parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39"

to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the
point of beginning.
PARCEL 3:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon
“Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco,
California,” filed in Book “H” of Maps, at pages 22
and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and
County of San Francisco, State of California, de-
scribed as follows:
BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of
said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from
the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence
southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a
distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said
Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and
running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots
45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting
84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel
with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26
feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2,935 feet; thence
(Proposition M, Continued)

at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90° 38' 50" north to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84° 02' 40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93° 57' 20" to the right and running northerly with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90° 16' 52" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:

PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84° 02' 40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89° 43' 05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90° 16' 52" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:

PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:

Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
BART DISTRICTS
District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.
District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETRAS DE IMPRENTA Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT. Signature will be compared with signature on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE November 2, 1982
I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVÍE LA BALOTA A:

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

5. Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other then that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ________________ 19___.

My residence address is ________________________________ Zip Code ________________________________

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distintas a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambié el ________ de 19___.
Mi dirección es ________________________________ Zip Code ________________________________

NOTA: Un votante que se cambia dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambia antes de los 29 días anteriores a la elección y que no se registre antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO: ABSENT VOTING SECTION
ENVIAR A: REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 159, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., TUESDAY, October 25, 1982, 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
Your ballot corresponds to "Yes" or "No". This number will appear on the face of the judge and Propositions. Circle the number that is correct for you, and fill in the boxes below the number that is correct for you. Write the names and numbers of your favorite candidates on this coupon.

**IF APPLICABLE:** This office may not appear on all ballot styles.
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>San Francisco Co.</td>
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Eric Moncur ......................... 31
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William Tocci ....................... 33
Ben Tom ........................... 34
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Dave Wharton ....................... 35

CANDIDATES FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION
Rosario Anaya ....................... 36
Margaret Crichton DeOsuna ............ 36
William Felzer ....................... 37
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Sodonia M. Wilson ................... 38
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Robert R. Bacci .................. 39
Mike S. Bernick .................. 39
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Robert A. DaPrato .................. 40
Carole Migden ..................... 41
Leland Moglen ..................... 41
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PROPOSITIONS
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Analysis .......................... 63
Arguments ......................... 64, 65
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Analysis .......................... 66
Arguments ......................... 67, 68
Text of Proposed Law .............. 99

PROPOSITION K
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Arguments ......................... 70-74
Text of Proposed Law .............. 99, 100

PROPOSITION L
Would declare opposition to construction of ramps to City Hall's main entrance.
Analysis .......................... 75
Arguments ......................... 76-78

PROPOSITION M
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Text of Proposed Law .............. Declaration: 100-101
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Governor

George "Duke" Deukmejian, Republican
Attorney General of California/Fiscal General of California

Vote for One

Vote por Uno

Elizabeth Martinez, Peace and Freedom
Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador

TOM BRADLEY, Democratic
Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcaldesa-Los Angeles

JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American Independent
Professional Tracker/Caminero

DAN P. DOUCHERTY, Libertarian
Businessman/Comerciante

Lieutenant Governor

LEO T. MCCARTHY, Democratic
Assemblyman, California Legislature/Assembleísta, de la Legislatura de California

JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian
Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor

CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom
State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Político

CAROL HALLETT, Republican
State Legislator/Farmer/Legislador Estatal/Granjero

HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent
Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles

Secretary of State

GORDON DUFFY, Republican
California State Legislator/Legislador del Estado de California

MILTON SHIRO TAKAI, Peace and Freedom
Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén

MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian
Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio

MARCH FONG EU, Democratic
Secretary of State, State of California/Secretaria de Estado, Estado de California

ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent
Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Candidate Information</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENNETH CORY, Democratic</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARY GINGELL, Libertarian</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“PAT” GRAHAM, American Independent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLORENCE MC DONALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Consejo de la Ciudad, Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrer de Obra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyst/Analista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Assistant Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, State Board of Equalization — 1st District</td>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Board of Equalization, Appraiser Member, First Dataset/Dereconse de la Evaluación, Miembro Primero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAYNE R. NYGREN, Libertarian</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WILLIAM H. “BILL” IVERS, Republican</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senator/Legisrador del Estado de California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### United States Senator

**United de Estados Unidos**  
**参議員**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Mayor of San Diego/Acule de San Diego</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economia</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Governor of California/Gobernador de California</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THERESA “TENA” DIETRICH, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Printer/Impresor</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representative in Congress—6th District

**Representativo en el Congreso—Distrito #6**  
**議員**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD C. CREIGHTON, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Mortgage Banker/Banquero Hipotecario</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMOTHY-ALLEN ALBERTSON, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Law Clerk/Clergyman/Empleado de Oficina Juridica/Clerigo</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS MC QUAI, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogado</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA BOXER, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>County Supervisor/Supervisor del Condado</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Senator—8th Senatorial District

**Senador Estatal—Distrito #8**  
**參議員**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL E. MAYAKIS, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Community Swissboard President/President de Tablo de Comunitarios de la Comunidad</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOY B. FORAN, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Senator/SENADOR ESTATAL</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEANNE C. GUTH, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Business Administrator/Administrador de Comercio</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member of the Assembly—17th Assembly District

**Miembro de la Asamblea—Distrito #17**  
**議員**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIE L. BROWN JR., Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Speaker, California Assembly/Orador Asambleista de California</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS S. CRARY, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL G. ZAHARAKIS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Worker/Ministro/Trabajador de la Comunidad/Clerigo</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONNIE HOY, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abortion Rights Activist/Activista a Favor del Derecho al Aborto</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
 Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal Supremo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>As Part of the Term</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANK K. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTO M. KAUS</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN E. BROUSSARD</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ REYNOSO</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES/SI</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One
 Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación, Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Uno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>As Part of the Term</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two
 Para Juez Presidente del Tribunal de Apelación, Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Dos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>As Part of the Term</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two
 Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación, Primer Distrito de Apelación, División Dos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>As Part of the Term</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Three

Shall BETTY BARRY-DEAL
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Yes/No

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Shall WINSLOW CHRISTIAN
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Yes/No

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Shall MARC POCHE
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?

Yes/No

Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1

Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1

Vote for One

Patrick (Pat) Lucey
Attorney/Abogada

116

Alfred G. Chiantelli
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal

117

Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8

Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8

Vote for One

Robert Silvestri
Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultante de Ingeniería de Transporte

121

Robert Barnes
Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes

122

Eugene Garfinkle
BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART

123

Bob Geary
Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Jefe de Colecciones de Impuestos de Alcantarillado

124

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
### Superintendent of Public Instruction

**Bill Honig**  
District School Superintendent/Superintendente de Distrito Escolar  
Vote for One  
Vote por Uno  
134 →

**Wilson Riles**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superintendente Estatal de Instrucción Públicas  
加州教育局長  
講選一名  
135 →

### Member, Board of Education

**William Felzer**  
Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería  
教育工程家  
139 →

**George L. O'Brien**  
Free Schooler/Economist/Instructor/Escolar Libre - Instructor de Economía  
自由教育者—經濟學教員  
140 →

**Margaret Crichton DeOsuna**  
Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raíces  
實業經紀  
141 →

**Myra Kopp**  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  
現任教育局委員  
142 →

**Sondia M. Wilson**  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  
現任教育局委員  
143 →

**Rosario Anaya**  
President San Francisco Board of Education/Presidente, Junta de Educación de San Francisco  
舊金山教育局主席  
144 →

### Member, Community College Board

**Robert E. Burton**  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  
現任社區大學校董  
148 →

**Robert R. Bacci**  
Lawyer/Abogado  
律師  
149 →

**Michael S. Bernick**  
Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia  
教授／機構主任  
150 →

**Robert A. De Prato**  
Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador  
醫生/教育家  
151 →

**Leland Moglen**  
Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.  
醫院行政人員  
152 →

**Carole Migden**  
Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Administradora/Planificadora Fiscal  
管理人員／經濟能算師  
153 →

**Alan S. Wong**  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  
現任社區大學校董  
154 →

**Sal Roselli**  
Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios  
商業經理  
155 →

**John Riordan**  
Incumbent/En el Cargo  
現任社區大學校董  
156 →
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote for no more than Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultor</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUIER</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Hoteles de Hotel</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1982</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1981</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veterans Bond Act of 1982</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lake Tahoe Acquisitions Bond Act</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>First-Time Home Buyers Bond Act of 1982</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Pension Fund Investment</td>
<td>Yes 206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MEDIDAS SOMETIDAS AL VOTO DE LOS VOTANTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número</th>
<th>Votos</th>
<th>Proposición</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>186 A Favor</td>
<td>ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRENDAMIENTO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de desembolsos para la construcción o mantenimiento de escuelas públicas.</td>
<td>1982年州校舍租-賃公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債5億元（$500,000,000），作為興建或改善公共學校的資金。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>187 Contra</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCEL DE CONDADO DE 1981. Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción y reparación de cáncel de condado y ejecución de mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.</td>
<td>1981年縣監獄基建費公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債2億8千萬元（$280,000,000），用作興建、重建、改修和更換監獄以及維護維修等費用。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>190 A Favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
<td>1982年退役人員公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債4億5千萬元（$450,000,000），用作資助加州退役人員購農場與房屋。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>191 Contra</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE. Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la cuenca de Lake Tahoe, necesaria para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar los valores paisajísticos y recreacionales de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad prevista por esta acta es $85,000,000.</td>
<td>購置太浩湖公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債8千5百萬元（$85,000,000），用作購買太浩湖盆地土地，防止這個獨特的自然資源環境的破壞，保護太浩湖的水土不致退化，保護太浩湖的風景和娛樂的價值。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>194 A Favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRADORES DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982. Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $200,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.</td>
<td>1982年第一次買屋者公債法案。 這個法案規定發行公債2億元（$200,000,000），用作資助買屋。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>195 Contra</td>
<td>INVERSIÓN DE FONDOS DE PENSION PÚBLICOS. Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos preferenciales de acciones comunes. Prescribe normas de inversión fiduciaria. Impacto fiscal. De ponerse en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañadas por riesgo mayor para los fondos, participantes, lo cual podría acarrear pérdidas capitales para los fondos,</td>
<td>公共養老金投資，准予州議會授權在特定普通股股票投資更大的比例。制定受托投資的標準，財政影響。一旦付諸實施，可能會增加利息和資本的增值而增加收益的機會，但風險亦大，以致用作投資的公共養老金和退休金可能要承擔資金的虧損。</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

TAXATION. REAL PROPERTY VALUATION. Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown. Local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions. YES 211 ➔ NO 212 ➔

TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE. Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency. YES 215 ➔ NO 216 ➔

SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS. NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-8, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs. YES 220 ➔ NO 221 ➔

UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS. Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties. YES 225 ➔ NO 226 ➔

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS. Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solidwaste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables. YES 229 ➔ NO 230 ➔

NUCLEAR WEAPONS. Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect. YES 233 ➔ NO 234 ➔
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211 SI 贊成
212 NO 反對

215 SI 贊成
216 NO 反對

220 SI 贊成
221 NO 反對

225 SI 贊成
226 NO 反對

229 SI 贊成
230 NO 反對

233 SI 贊成
234 NO 反對

地方政体暂許轉移資金用作維修、修正限制，償債基準由應計「現值」改為「預期稅收」，財政影響，無直接財政影響，照分析員的評述，它可能減輕借款的機構所負擔的利息，反過來來說，非借款機構原可賺取的利息則受到削減。

學校校田書，非公立學校，須積蓄校款，採取建揚積的方式，在特別條件下，校撥款款給
在非公立學校就讀的學生，財政影響，要在付
諸實施數年才會發生影響，一旦付諸實施，這項
類似 1980-81 年州議會的六百萬項，將使州政府的每年增加經費將有六百萬，另第八
年級生第十二年到每年增加經費一百萬元，行
政費的增幅不詳。

統一高等院。地方法院與審判法院，若經縣
選舉人多數票通過，州議會可以在縣內統一各
法院。財政影響，要在付諸實施後才會發生影
響，一旦付諸實施，州與／或縣會因省法官
要付更高薪額而增加薪額和退休金的支開，行
政費或可能節省的經費，數目不詳，各縣可能
現差很大。

飲料容器，規定退回來的空瓶，可獲得五分或
五分以上的回扣價值，財政影響，總的財政影
響不能斷言。可能會減少垃圾的清理費和固體
廢料處理費，稅收的減增，數目不詳，請參閱
立法分析員對有關差別的分析。

核武庫，要求州長寫信給總統。呼籲他向蘇聯
建議聯合停止核武器的試驗、生產和部署，財
政影響，無直接財政影響。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $125,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RECURSOS HIDRAULICOS. Agregue estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre ciudades, permite asignaciones para aguas fuertemente usadas del Río Shasta y reglamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de agua residuaria. Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1,48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de regulación; pérdida desconocida de renta de oriente eléctrico y alquiler desconocido de terrenos propiedad del estado. El cálculo de los Analistas no toma en cuenta el impacto.

237 SI 负责
238 NO 反对

COMISION DE NUEVO PRORRATO. Aboga por el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo prorrogo y establece una cantidad para realizar un nuevo prorrogo de distritos legislativos y de igualización comparables con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en presupuestos del Analista, habrá un aumento de costos estatales de $126,000 en 1983 y una cantidad comparable por lo menos cada 10 años empezando en 1991.

241 SI 负责
242 NO 反对

ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidos en el Estado. Prohíbe la prescripción legislativa absoluta de la posibilidad de venta de armas de fuego. Impacto fiscal: Impacto imposible de determinar. Aumentaría los costos administrativos resultantes de la necesidad de registrar y cobrar por estos servicios. Impacto desconocido sobre el costo de mantenimiento del sistema de justicia criminal. Podría afectar los fondos de impostos a la venta y la venta. Vea el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los variables.

245 SI 负责
246 NO 反对

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

249 SI 负责 A ¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanxs, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre mala conducta de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

250 NO 反对

252 SI 负责 B ¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y equipos relacionados a la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deberán exceder 5% de la cantidad de cada $100 de ingresos de propiedad basada en el requisito de que los administradores que excedan esta cantidad sean sancionados mediante la emisión de bonos?

253 NO 反对

256 SI 负责 C ¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagarles a las empresas particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolso por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

257 NO 反对

259 SI 负责 D ¿Deberá la ciudad subvencionar a los ciudadanos particulares para alquilar, comprar viviendas, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para usos industriales, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolso por las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda u obligación sobre la Ciudad?

260 NO 反对

市政府的提案在同—基础上增加在职和退休市员工福利，一如市政府所提出的保健服务制度在内的在职和退休员工。
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7 1/4% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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261 SI 贊成
¿Se deberá permitir el cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión a los 60 años de edad?

262 NO 反對

263 SI 贊成

264 NO 反對

265 SI 贊成

266 NO 反對

267 SI 贊成
¿Deberá pagarsele a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

268 NO 反對

269 SI 贊成
¿Deberá el tipo de contribución para los empleados municipales de la ciudad al Sistema de Jubilaciones fijarse en el 7 1/2% de la compensación de estos empleados?

270 NO 反對

271 SI 贊成
¿Deberá crear el Departamento de Policía un nuevo Plan de Jubilación a incapacidad para miembros uniformados después del 1º de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los platos actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

272 NO 反對

273 SI 贊成
¿Deberá pagar a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberán dárselse tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajar en días feriados, según lo solicite el oficial?

274 NO 反對

275 SI 贊成
¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas numeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la esquina de servicios eléctricos en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completarse el estudio?

276 NO 反對

277 SI 贊成

278 NO 反對

279 SI 贊成

280 NO 反對

281 SI 贊成
¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de planificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Perantiesas Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificándose la propiedad para su ubicación?

282 NO 反對

283 SI 贊成

284 NO 反對

285 SI 贊成

286 NO 反對

287 SI 贊成

288 NO 反對

289 SI 贊成

290 NO 反對

291 SI 贊成

292 NO 反對

293 SI 贊成

294 NO 反對

295 SI 贊成

296 NO 反對

297 SI 贊成

298 NO 反對

299 SI 贊成

300 NO 反對
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#16—Area East of _______ (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN _______ (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of _______ (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of _______ (virgule lines)
#8—Area SOUTH of _______ (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3).

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
• three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
• two State Senate Districts (SD 3, 8)
• two United States Congressional Districts (CD 5, 6)
See map elsewhere in this pamphlet.

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

Q—What about the United States Senator. Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982.
Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
• going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
• mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters’ handbook.

Q—What shall I write when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
• that you need to vote early
• your address when you signed up to vote
• the address where you want the ballot mailed
• then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters Handbook (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polls to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question: Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.

When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney
My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscoan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique Olocemedy, Albert Wollenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing: Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


Alfred G. Chiantelli

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Gargano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reina, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tanzy, Frances Verucci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felon Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz, Yori Wada, Juvenile Justice, U.C. Regent.

E. Patricia Lacey
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian
My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR
BOB GEARY

My age is 42
My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator
My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART’s current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force – San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee – San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committee Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:

- San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
- Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
- Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: “The people don’t care.”
- “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
- Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
- Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
- Silvestri favors police “decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
- Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who’s Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
- East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
- For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflamable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:

Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 560 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Denis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christianna H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Protestant Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jen, 1250 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1769 McAllister, Clerk

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32

Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coskun, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellinson, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carloe M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Katherine G. Ikemari, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian P. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate. Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4403-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
P. J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bd.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idaho Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri-Real.
Robert DeVries, 3511-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James S. Herman, 633 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Potheadle Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
G. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F.
P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Geneviee Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wofford, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Remne, 3715 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramirez Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Dencheim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessy, 160 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bessent, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobentz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belsie Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.I. W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskovitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane Mckaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Fenton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Yukich, 177 Altoa, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yorinada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilanitas, Minister
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street
My occupation is Letter Carrier
My age is 36


Diana Coleman

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic
Jacquelyne E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Elliott, 733-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 246 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Hegami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larson, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian D. Post, 322 Mangels, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist

My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality . . . safer neighborhoods . . . stronger rent control . . . affordable housing . . . control downtown growth . . . employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist
Barbara M. Cameron, 290-5th Ave., Data Processing
Madeline Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gillis, 250 McAllister St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Roma Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Delton St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee
Pat Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator
Dennis Peros, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist
Arthur W. Simon, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Rikki Stretcher, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive
 Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.
Carmen Vazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist
Tim Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

JERRY R. DE YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extra-ordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shipping & Receiving Clerk
Andrew Colon, 69 Webster St., Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 540 Lawson St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Granit, 1828-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gudel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Redney A. Hillcoat, 88 Waterview St., Distribution Att’d Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pl., Accountant
Douglas W. Quick, 211 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst./Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stampsbery, 2227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat. Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Sunner St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2311-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkle, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My qualifications for office are: Background: Native San Francisco. Combat Veteran WWII-Korea. Master’s Degree, San Francisco State; Second Master’s and Ph.D., U.C., Berkeley. Taught Balboa High, City College, 1955-Present. Served as San Francisco Supervisor and School Board Member-President. Married, three children.

Record: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Alioto, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 3105 Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Raymond J. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Buscheria, 537-10th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cals, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.M.W. Conkрадt, 631 Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rosi Crabbe, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Turava St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 2300-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim F. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Francis M. McKeever, 130 Santa Ana Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O’Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymond, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, SJ, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeleine Samaras, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scallon, 631 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digby St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

MARTIN LEE ENG
My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29
My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.
My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.
I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.
Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.
Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.
All my affiliates are not responsible for my platforms.
Martin Eng can win!  

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:
Ted Akins, 1882 Green St, Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St, C.P.A.
Terrel L. Brockith, 35 Vanderbilt, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Belli, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rodden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1731 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinar, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Petershier, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anna, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner
  Member, Landmark Preservation Board
Al A. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd, Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St, Maintenanceman
D. Scherr, 1731 Vallejo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strauss, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robbin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER
My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43
My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all I have a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a super-visor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:
Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St, Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paulette Beliveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jarett L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irna Crenshaw, 559 Wailer St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliott, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitsch, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoemaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Truzko, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Barlett St., Houseman

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

RICHARD D. HONGISTO
My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45
My qualifications for office are: I bring to the Board twenty years of government service and administrative experience:
- Policeman for 10 years,
- Sheriff, elected twice,
- Commissioner of prison system,
- Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lia Triff Belli, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Berstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Bonvicini, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agrapino R. Cerbato, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lilly Cuno, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Direct. Victim Witness

Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1400 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women

Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jabe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library Commission

Lenny King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 540-39th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director

Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinaro, 1332 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors

Kirt Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.F. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ovye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator

Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Plisch, 471 Hoffman Ave, Director, Board of Permit Appeals

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourne, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Counselor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinkey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dila Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-36th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 869 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vienna, Accountant

Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 885 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife

Miguel Quiraz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator

Detor
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Fentress, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachel Cotonerreader, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1046 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 152-48th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator

Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Andrew (Daddy Andy) Jones
My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55
My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission Community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing, I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:

Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Cautrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Beggins, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Joe Bernstein, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helfand, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Mutock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Papadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 354 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspan, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo
My occupation is Urban Planner
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn’t do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:

Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrne Rae Ahonen, 440 Geyser, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beazley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2460 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 555 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Laumer, 4118A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McNamara, 1151 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Vicor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Moses, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Scheiman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wiseley, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER

My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney.
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1975; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California’s major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Bill Maher

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:

Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Easeld Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shrade, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Boviere, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Commons, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Estes, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Filbert St., Pres. Labor's Union
George Fosu, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Haisted, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, I.WU.
Anna Konzenberg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Michak, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member, N.A.W.W. Women's Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 40 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer's Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

BETTY ANN McMAHON

My address is 880 Portola Drive
My occupation is School District Consultant
My age is 57
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan who cares about San Francisco. I taught in the San Francisco School District for thirty years and now work as a consultant.

I take great pride in San Francisco and it hurts me to see how some politicians have used our city government to the detriment of our best interests.

I will work to achieve a responsible city housing policy, equitable taxes for homeowners and businesses and to free our fire and police forces from political interference.

I am dedicated to San Francisco's future and with your help, together, we can make it one to look forward to.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:

Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Currivan, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443 22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 570 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forslund, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Horn, 2522 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Sue Melehaney, 125 Joaquina Way, Retired
Joseph L. Misuraca, 2353 Fulton Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3381 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 1253-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocca, 175 Lansdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapiro, 66 Soteo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shin, 2 San Marco Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 570 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Robert A. Stewart, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 235 Shrade St., Nurse Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Yalon, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERIC MONCUR

My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build, homeowners freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY

My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.
I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Julie C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Amerie Azevedo, 269 Cheney St., Radio Producer
Ophelia R. Balderrama, 271-19th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Melanie F. Crocm, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danis, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Geottinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Duda, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Lockeray, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
Monroe Garfield, M.D., 85 Cleary Court
H. Alfred Hanken, 955 Harrison St., Business Man.
Alana Hartzok, 269 Chenery, Education Director
David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hiraibayashi, 3777 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sabourin, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrofani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Montecito, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Wou, 1729 Lake St., Educator

The Sponsors for K. F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Paulette Burks, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 5751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loretta L. Dungan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynn Cine Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paula "Rain" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Malone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Steklsr, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 190 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Szego, 3740-25th St.,
David A. Whidden, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41
My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen’s Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.
My priorities include:
- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable.
- Creating needed services for seniors.
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
- Assuring healthful drinking water.
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.
My votes have benefited both renters and property owners.

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:

Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 895 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 440 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie K. Brooks, 100 Stonerest Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urban Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2985-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Mitchell, 135 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Elise St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanagh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lefty” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cohnen Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women’s Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 486 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kenniston, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 3576 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It’s time for a change!

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:
Alfred D. Bacci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummins, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOsuna, 3774-B Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Gubengay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Garcia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Koshne, 2675-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Claire Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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OLGA TALAMANTE
My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO
My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:

Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austin, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elsie, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68% Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2238-30th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latino, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR VFW Post 4103
Albert Park Ll, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur's Union Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgia Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 830 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1000 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union Local 38
John Viberger, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters Local 860
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BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member, San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56

My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city's communities, leaders and constituents.

I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 10 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaques, 62 Woodland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrapino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Mays Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denehein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herrman, 635 Connecticut, President L.L.W.U.
Ruth S. Kadiash, 145 Del Mar, Airports Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turkus Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 453 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Bellese Daly, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steve J. Dow, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoitada Wada, 636-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Meezy, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42

My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 39 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvici, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruschea, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Deemar, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanyan St., Commissioner
Joseph Friedas, Jr., 3360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 435 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 20700 O'Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 30 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachter, 155 Vickersburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton

Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Yoitada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

Doris M. Ward

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvey, 234 Gate, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres., Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hgts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hornel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Agar Jacks, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomata N. Scott, 1912 Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Sunley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 565-40th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 186 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilliards, Minister

DAVE WHARTON
My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42
San Francisco needs a new voice.
I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.
Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

Dave Wharton

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chenery St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armiyo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Bole Jr., 990 Prague St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Fingold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Moritimer Fleischacker III, 13 Bridgeway Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Garel, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconni, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morten, 2578-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nordoa, 4086-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsey R. Navarette, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neupert, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Hern, 3539 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 380 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Rentfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscaper
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Szumski, 508 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA
My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain. Rosario Anaya

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA
My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste. Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 657 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
John Baird, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr. 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8855 Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonica, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Estave, 5245 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzales, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadosh, 145 Delmar St., Airport Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Meezy, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr. 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefani, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 3774B Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 95 Park St., Retiree
Virginia Creighton, 350 Arbalo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nouar Taqui-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazzal, 7 Lockley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mirpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkunst, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 135 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curlin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Moore, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Aleyen Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 3774B Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramone P. Navarro, 2107 Aleyen Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 413 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3774B Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pettit, 30 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 316-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 3774-B Mission St., Student
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WILLIAM FELZER

My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience. City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President; American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:

New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.

Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.

Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:

Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shummon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equal. Member
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1311-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betty J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Piacignelli, 346 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Geiger, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kerkhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Rutli L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barcojo, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1250-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Dang, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Sup't.
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pailin, 4201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Sollari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanston, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tassman, 1534-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zisko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Floris, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordonez Espelund, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

MYRA KOPF

My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.

Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.

Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.

I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agripino Cerbatas, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Cohnitz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Tezador Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denheine, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennepenny, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margal Kaufman, 3530-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinar, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mor, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemerovski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3723 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burt Tolier, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Educator Member Board of Supervisors
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN
My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.

If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.

People will control education when government doesn’t!

Vote for George O'Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O'Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.
My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 3½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco's Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women's Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D-Clinical Psychology.

Sodonia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for Sodonia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloan Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers’ Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minster
Josephine E. Cole, 1559-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkle Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 474-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Guerrero St., State Gov’t. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 620-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

The Sponsors for George O’Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave, Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DaPra, 374 Laidey, Physician
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bonnie Haxo, 930 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroult, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannah M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2515 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francois G. Goetz, 130 Cliffdoro Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ir W. Carter, 1330-38th Ave., Commi Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeitz, 130 Cliffdoro Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballot Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
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ROBERT R. BACCI

My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today's San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK

My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:
Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgat, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Koss Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 55 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Guptil, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 2250 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 Sun Benito, Executive
Wafer G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williard, Area Housing Manager
Robert O. Johns, 4547-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 460-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Patterson, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2359 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 101 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William P. Terheyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Yuskich, 177 San Lukeo West, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whisman, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Verba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agrinoco R. Caracci, 64 Cool Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5235 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Gooseby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Licardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. ILWU
Queinio Kopp, 65 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm.
Leland J. Lazarius, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Pete Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Frinick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Name/Registrar Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandoval, 756-27th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Starr, 445 Chestnut, Journalist/Educator
Byron F. Wong, 1554-38th Ave., Attorney
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ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.

My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SCCD
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women's Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2017 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daby, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 2305-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connect Street, President II. WU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Aga Jaidas, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Kortum, 80 Merced Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Melinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 345 Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Felton Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37

My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:

— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.

— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.

— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

Robert A. Da Prato

The Sponsors for Robert A. Da Prato are:

Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O'Brien, 1506-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St. Registered Nurse
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Donny, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comml. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Pennei L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Gulin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
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CAROLE MIGDEN

My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34

My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
- to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
- to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
- to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

Carole Migden

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:

Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 224 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 302-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 830-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Bruno, 110 Hoffhman Ave., Library Advocate
Donna J. Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agrinopito R. Cerbato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Height St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education Member
San Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Eliaser, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Alises Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., S.P. Party County Chair
Edith Asinth Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margot Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reitman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomastro N. Scott, 1011 Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelema Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nacey G. Walker, 226 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2199-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLEN,
M.S.; J.D.

My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38

My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions. One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:

George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tsao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Serano Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 746 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zeider Madalchan, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kilwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 768-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cucia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merji, 314 Kearney, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedro, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilynn Sperber, 2655 Chestnut St, Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevon, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gamon, 4118 Moraga St, Receptionist
Patricia J. Decrescenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

SAL ROSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager
My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

Sal Rosselli

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammann, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-9th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waler St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3231-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukis, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritoda Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilmarrs, Minister

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4400-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shreder, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-43rd Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1601 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2344 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotheodore Kitt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.
Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Marguerite Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Toberiner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wofford, 91 Sanches, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1200 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR COMM. COLLEGE BOARD

ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master’s Degree in social work. Since 1959, I’ve served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:

Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-30th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agnipao R. Cerbator, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager

Zuretti L. Goosby, 399 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hepp, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Uranus Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired

John Riordan, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cecil Williams, 69 Hiltritas St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QuICK! What’s a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER:

City Hall
day. Apply now in Room 155
Work at the polls on election day.

RÁPIDO! ¿Cuál es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

Obre mismO
Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Las elecciones. Ofrezca un servicio en la
Trabaje en las oficinas de votación el día de
PROPOSITION A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens’ complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators’ salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens’ complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.

— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.

— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.

— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman

Jeff Brown
Public Defender

Jo Daly
Police Commissioner

Michael Hennessy
Sheriff

Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court-ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That’s just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer's authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A


— MOSCONÉ MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCONÉ MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don't demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda “Committee for Economic Democracy” proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of “fat” APPOINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the “POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT” are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it’s efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can “dream up” more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPayers ASSOCIATION

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960’s that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspended and terminated by the Chief or the Police Commission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfaction of our citizens, as well as providing a sound mechanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a “cure-all”, but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serving.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Muni Acquisitions

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52. Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On August 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today's high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs . . . Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco’s Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco’s dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don’t give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!

Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Surviving Spouse Health Benefits

PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System Fund for active and retired employees. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would provide that the City contribute to the Health Service System Fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System Fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"

On July 12, the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
John L. Moliniari  Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne  Board of Supervisors
Richard D. Hongisto  Board of Supervisors
Lee Dobion  Board of Supervisors
Wendy Nelder  Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver  Board of Supervisors
Harry G. Brit  Board of Supervisors
Nancy G. Walker  Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy  Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward  Board of Supervisors
F. Walter Johnson  Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
SURVIVING SPOUSE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee's surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee's surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller's Statement on "E"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION E APPEARS ON PAGE 89.

How Supervisors Voted on "E"
On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!
Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE “YES” ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one “provider” and one “dependent” in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition “E” are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote “YES” on Proposition E.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse’s life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: “The costs cannot be accurately determined.”

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said “Quote” “The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it’s a new field. We have no actuarial data.”

“We also do not know how many people the plan would affect.”

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:

William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Supervisors' Salary

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller's Statement on "G"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on "G"

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

2.100 Composition and Salary
The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ($9,600) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8343 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco's supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco's supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board's responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors' salaries to $23,924:

— This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

— This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors' pay in the other Bay Area counties.

— This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts that the Board recently made in its own budget.

— This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent's complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside "part-time" income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent!! Vote YES!

W. F. O'Keefe, Sr, President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
Supervisors' Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it’s the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors’ current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors’ salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco’s taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS’ SALARIES.

| Michael Laderman            | Nicholas Sapunar |
| San Francisco Common Cause  | William Best    |
| Kamini Gupta                | Priscilla Scannell |
| William Reed                | Dennis Antonore |
| Sam Duca                    | Valerie Pope    |
| Cynthia Landi               | Janet Wentworth |
| Catherine Scanlon           | Don Kates       |
| James Stark                 | Leo Murphy      |
| William Murray              | Frank Aiello    |
| Emmet Condon               | Victorino Hermoso |
| Alessandro Baccari          | Willis Hanniway |
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that’s the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors’ pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can’t. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don’t have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON “G”.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O’Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Beatrice Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farberstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Minich
Dorothy Nusley
Caroline Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramos
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Eppinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margaret McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elswander
Frank and Maud Carli
Rita Dallinmonti
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marion Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fugarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allison
Stephen Garbaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gurn
Cheryl Mantel
Frank Noccarato
Ruth Pasen
Eunice Maxwell
Hal Cruzan
Walter G. Joe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerald Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Luebello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongnian
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Gunn
Walter and Fern Feingold
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Rice
Lorna Follett
William McGrath

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Supervisors' Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor's salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

- The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).
- Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.
- People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

- A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.
- Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it's the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magnin

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952:

Let's break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually 11 x $9,600 $ 105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per

month — $21,450 annually times 11 235,950

Total $ 600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication noted in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote "NO"!!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary (Democratic Committee)
Former City Commissioner Terence Faulkner

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors' pay to 25% of the Mayor's salary): "The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time."

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican Committee)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committee)
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City's Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee's contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City's Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller's Statement on "H"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition "H."

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on "H"

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted "No."

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").
“Miscellaneous” Employees’ Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide “Fixed” employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on “age at entry” into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on “age at entry” is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board’s Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a “fixed” rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, “age at entry” rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City’s rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years’ cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers’ Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,

(Continued on page 90)
Police Retirement

PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller's Statement on "I"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.

How Prop I Got on Ballot
On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%), reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. I.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

64
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Looking for work? Look no further!
Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd. Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿Busca trabajo? ¡No busque mas!
Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el dia de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Proposition J will change the rate of pay for overtime and holidays for members of the Police Department. The change will bring the Police Department up to a comparable level to other local law enforcement agencies and other city employees.

Join with me and vote yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote "YES"!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

CAPITULO I.
OPORTUNIDAD DE EMPLEO

Usted puede trabajar en las elecciones de la Ciudad de San Francisco el 2 de noviembre. Si usted es bilingüe será especialmente bienvenido. Trabará auxiliando a los electores en los lugares de votación de su distrito electoral.
Pida una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía, Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
Electric Utility Ownership

PROPOSITION K

Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E’s Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you’re right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 “public power” cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn’t pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city’s hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy’s cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go “public power”. And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

Palo Alto (public): $11.06  Sacramento (public): $15.00
Redding (public): $12.35  San Francisco (PG&E): $34.28
Santa Clara (public): $14.50

CONSUMER ACTION
Kay Pachtner, Co-director

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson  Eulalio Frausto  Thomas McCarthy
Assemblyman Art Agnos  Corinne Frugoni  Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Rob Baker  Richard Gaskiewski  Anne Moore
Robert Barnes  Golden Gate Alliance  Robert Moore
Bernice Biggs  Dan Goldstein  Arthur Morris
Black Political Caucus  Dr. Zuretti Goosby  Jack Morrison
Al Borrice  Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Nob Hill Neighbors
Supervisor Harry Britt  Council  Michael Nolan
Dale Butler  Vincent Hallman  Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
Lula Carter  Sue Hester  San Francisco Democratic Club
Manuel Caballos  Joe Hughes  San Francisco County
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.  Espanola Jackson  Democratic Central Committee
Citizens Party of San Francisco  Candice Jensen  Cynthia Sharpe
Gene Coleman  Judy Kaplan  Frances Shahan
Ina Deerman  Alton Brennan Kwasnik  Stanley Shields
Connie Ford  David Looman  James Shoch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Snead
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starchuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caran Wyland
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Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist
Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neilands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote “YES”!!!
BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(Democratic Committeeman)
Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON “K”

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called “municipalization” of P.G. & E.'s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on “municipalization” and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we’d have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we’d be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can’t. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930’s, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON “K”

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That’s why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city’s utility tax on the lifetime segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It’s a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control of management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “ecomonical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
Electric Utility Ownership

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco's continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be farther from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City's hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn't mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital "lifeline" service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don't sacrifice our City's future on the flawed altar of "municipal ownership." We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

*Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner's property (as much as $15 million).

*Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).

*Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.

*At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).

*A huge new City administrative staff.

*Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn't require a "feasibility study" that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Naomi Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City's payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility's franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City's financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)

Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)
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Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
City Hall Ramps

PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

YES = No Ramps
NO = Build the Ramps

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco's world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The "Can't use the side door" fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient "off-street" access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!
Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on "symbolism" to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractable, "costs be damned" career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to "butcher" the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn't enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L.

Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls...

A NATIONAL LANDMARK.

Grove Street entrance, carefully and sensitively improved, will provide entry meeting legal requirements and be safer and more convenient.

TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL, Inc.
Ramona Albright, Vice President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Why wreck historic landmarks???

Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition "L" denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners developed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition "L" would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition "L" is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on "L" for Equal Access!

Organizations for identification

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judith Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCPA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamante, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor's Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Westla Whitfield
Lucille Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodlaw
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sedonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKeel Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolford, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatre Rhonecros
Dmitri Belser
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wilson, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rubberg

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it's possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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**PROPOSITION M**

Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

---

**Analysis**

By Ballot Simplification Committee

**THE WAY IT IS NOW:** The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

**THE PROPOSAL:** Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

**A YES VOTE MEANS:** If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

**A NO VOTE MEANS:** If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

---

**Controller’s Statement on “M”**

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

---

**How Prop M Got on Ballot**

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

---

**THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.**
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees #1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Samaras, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 310
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco’s housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project’s site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O’Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O’Connell

William Sepatiss
David Finn
Sylvia Durrance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Beard, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andrea Blum, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devon Char, M. D.
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Dedo, M. D.
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.
Samuel Stegman, M. D.
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylie, M. D.
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman
Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco’s taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will go TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherney
Ted Soulsis
Gene Prat
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL:

VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P. in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Bards Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Bards
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIOUS TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straightforward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed “medically oriented” use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other “ancillary commercial areas” in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote “NO” on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote “NO” on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

San Francisco Civic Associations
SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUNIOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGEWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide bal-

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucik
Mike Cucik
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Robert Fenton
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadja Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill
Ellen Huppert
Peter Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobsen
Paul Johnson
Jackie Latanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Matthew LaVail
Margaret Northcoit
Kenny O'Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicki Saltan
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote “NO”!!!
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
(Proposition A, Continued)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ((in amount not to) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the 1st of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
(Proposition B, Continued)
shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described; (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions; (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureau thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(ff) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)

---

**TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSITION C**
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7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be pursuant to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System(1), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purpose, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423. For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service system fund any sums, except as hereinafore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in Section 8.425; and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with Sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therefore includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)
the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years, said service to be computed under subsection (G) hereof, may retire for service at his option. Members shall be retired on the first day of the month next following the attainment by them of the age of sixty-five years. A member retired after reaching the age of sixty years shall receive a service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¼</td>
<td>1.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¼</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.6750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6750</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 percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued) 

revoke a portion of the city's retirement system and filed at the office of said system on the date immediately preceding the date on which his compulsory retirement would otherwise have become effective and he shall be paid forthwith his accumulated contributions, with interest credited thereon. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 8.514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not less than $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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 retirement allowance is calculated in such case shall be based on the compensation earnable by the member in the classes of service rendered by him during the one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances. The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement. 

(D) No modification of benefits provided in this section shall be made because of any amounts payable to or on account of any member under women's compensation laws of the State of California. 

(E) If a member shall die, before his retirement, regardless of cause: 

1) If no benefit is payable under subdivision (2) of this subsection (E), 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 subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows: 

(a) 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
(Proposition H, Continued)

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 reposition 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 within 90 days after the retirement board determines the termination to be permanent, whether to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund and to receive benefits only as provided in this paragraph. Failure to make such election shall be deemed an irrevocable election to withdraw his accumulated contributions. A person who elects to allow his accumulated contributions to remain in the retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive retirement allowance in an amount equal to the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary.

(G) The following time and service shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member for the purpose of determining whether such member qualifies for retirement and calculating benefits:

1. Time during which said member is a member of the retirement system and during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a miscellaneous officer or employee.

2. Service in the fire and police departments which is not credited as service of a member under this section shall count under this section upon transfer of a member of either of such departments to employment entitling him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be adjusted by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments.

3. Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section.

4. Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507.

5. The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county.

(H) 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 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
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on such deductions according to service credited, shall be paid to the retirement system following the removal of such limit, in manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution 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 contributions of the teachers as provided in section 8.507, 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 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.)

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member under Section 8.509, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraph (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 the 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, plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (5), any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(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, including membership on boards and commissions, or shall 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 superceded 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), (E) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 hereof submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the system subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

"Retirement allowance," "death allowance" or "allowance" shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, or upon the day following the date of death, as the case may be, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member of the Police Department of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," "death allowance" and "death benefit."

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said department.

"Retirement system or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 at the meeting in which the requirement in the two sentences next preceding shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member's final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, the allowance shall be reduced with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediate-ly prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least 20 years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the 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 spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse following the death of a member unless they were married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

8.590-5 Payment to Surviving Dependents

Upon the death of a member of the police department resulting from any cause, other than an injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, (a) if his death occurred after qualification for service retirement, under section 8.590-2, or after retirement for service or because of disability which resulted from any cause other than 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 marriage, to his surviving spouse. or (b) if his death occurred after the completion of at least twenty (20) years of service in the aggregate, three-fourths of the retirement allowance to which he would have been entitled under section 8.590-2 shall be continued throughout life or until remarriage to his surviving spouse, or (c) 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 spouse, except that, if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance continued shall be adjusted upon the date of 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 (d) if his death occurred after completion of at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, an allowance in an amount equal to the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled pursuant to section 8.590-3 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 spouse. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they 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 spouse and no children under the age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, “surviving spouse” shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. “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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
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city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit

If a member of the police department shall die before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit

Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement, or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department at the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:

(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.

(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in section 8.590-14.

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds

All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:

(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provident or retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.

(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to be the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, or at the later date of a periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits hereafter to be paid to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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 valu-
tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office.

(3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
(Proposition I, Continued) fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year. A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided, however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARter AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION J

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this subsection. For service performed in excess of the basic week, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of [(straight time)] time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of [(straight time)] time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of [(straight time)] time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half [(in the judgment of the police commission)] as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE

PROPOSITION K

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco; which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
(Proposition K, Continued)
a system; determination of the mechanisms necessary for conversion of such a system from municipal ownership to consumer ownership; and examination of models of governance and management for such a public or consumer-owned utility. The feasibility study should also consider the alternative of a system which provides electricity to the residential and industrial sections of the city and county at a lesser rate than to that portion of the city and county within the area commonly known as the "Downtown Assessment District." In addition to examining alternatives, the contractor shall make recommendations from among the alternatives, based on the criterion of cost-efficiency and such other criteria as may be suggested by the Public Utilities Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors.

2. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out the study in question. Within 210 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize and the Mayor shall approve such expenditure of funds from the Public Utilities Department budget as may be necessary to fund such a study, provided that such funds not be diverted from operating expenses of the Department, but instead be taken from revenues normally available for funding of studies by the Department. The contractor for such study shall be directed to complete and present the study to the Public Utilities Commission no later than June 10, 1964.

3. That, following submission of the completed feasibility study to the city and county by the contractor, the Board of Supervisors shall place the question of acquisition, including condemnation of property and bond authorization, before the people at the general election next following submission of the study.

Should any provision of this ordinance for any reason be held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby but will remain in full force and effect. Further, no provision of this ordinance shall be construed in such a way as to prevent the accomplishment of the feasibility study called for above.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco, in order to promote and protect the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare and to protect the character and stability of the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center, and to promote the orderly and beneficial development of such area, to enact ordinances, resolutions, and all other acts necessary to provide for the appropriate zoning and to permit the construction of a hotel for guests of not less than two hundred bedrooms or more than two hundred twenty-five bedrooms, restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facilities and other ancillary commercial areas with additional thirty housing units which can be sold at a fair market price or rented at a fair rental market price. Furthermore, there shall be provisions for off-street parking spaces for a minimum of one hundred thirty-five automobiles.

The aforesaid facilities shall be constructed in an area in close proximity to the aforesaid medical complex and medical center, which area is specifically described as follows:

That certain real property situated in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

PARCEL 1:

Portions of lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the westerly line of said lot 45; running thence easterly along said southerly line of Carl Street 36 feet; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the right and running southerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 32,664 feet; thence deflecting 90°20'34" to the right

100 and running westerly 35,807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2:

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35,808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 3:

PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence
at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflection 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

**PARCEL 4:**

PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 3.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

**PARCEL 5:**

PORTIONS OF Lots 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

**PARCEL 6:**

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

**PARCEL 7:**

PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

**PARCEL 8:**

PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

**PARCEL 9:**

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

**PARCEL 10:**

Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
BART DISTRICTS

District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACION PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTEAUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTERS DE IMPRENTA: Application MUST ALSO BE SIGNED BELOW BY APPLICANT. 
正楷書寫姓名 Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE
November 2, 1982

I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

Por la presente solicito una balota de Votante Ausente para la elección indicada arriba.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIEME LA BALOTA A:

Zip Code

DATE: ________________
FECHA: ________________

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

5. ...

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ____________________ 19 ___.
My residence address is ____________________ \n
NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA Cambiado
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambie el ____________________ de 19 ___.
Mi dirección es ____________________ 

NOTE: Un votante que se cambia dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambia antes de los 29 días anteriores de la elección y que no se registra antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 156, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, October 25, 7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA DEL REGISTRADOR ANTES DE LAS 5:00 H. DE LA TARDE, MARTES 25 de OCT.
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA ELECCION.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
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Your rights as a handicapped voter appear elsewhere in this pamphlet. See Index.
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### Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM BRADLEY, Democratic</td>
<td>Mayor-Los Angeles/Alcaldes-Los Angeles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES C. GRIFFIN, American Independent</td>
<td>Professional Trucker/Caminero</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN P. DOUGHERTY, Libertarian</td>
<td>Businessman/Comerciante</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE &quot;DUKE&quot; DEUKMEJIAN, Republican</td>
<td>Attorney General of California/Fiscal General of California</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH MARTINEZ, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Author, Editor, Organizer/Autor, Redactor, Organizador</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party/Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Político</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL HALLETT, Republican</td>
<td>State Legislator/Farmer/Legislator Estatal/Granjero</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent</td>
<td>Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MCCARTHY, Democratic</td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislator/Asambleista, de la Legislatura de California</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian</td>
<td>Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian</td>
<td>Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH FONG EU, Democratic</td>
<td>Secretary of State, State of California/Secretario de Estado, Estado de California</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON DUFFY, Republican</td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legislar del Estado de California</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Controller

MARY GINGELL, Libertarian
Transportation Service Manager/Gerente de Servicios de Transporte
運輸服務經理 27 →

“PAT” GRAHAM, American Independent
Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante 女商人 28 →

FLORENCE MC DONALD, Peace and Freedom
City Council Member, Berkeley/Miembro del Concejal de la Ciudad, Berkeley 柏克萊市市參議員 29 →

JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican
Attorney at Law/Abogado 律師 30 →

KENNETH CORY, Democratic
California State Controller/Controlador del Estado de California 加州審計官 31 →

Treasurer

JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic
State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal 州司庫 35 →

ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent
Analyst/Analista 分析員 36 →

LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian
Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado 審定公共會計師 37 →

KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom
Steelworker/Herrero de Obra 鋼鐵工人 38 →

DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican
Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo 企業財務人員 39 →

Attorney General

GEORGE NICHOLSON, Republican
Senior Assistant: Attorney General/Primer Auxiliar Fiscal General 資深副司法廳長 42 →

JOHN VAN DE KAMP, Democratic
District Attorney, Los Angeles County/Procurador del Distrito de Condado de Los Ángeles 洛杉磯縣地方檢察官 43 →

BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian
Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil 民事自由律師 44 →

DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom
Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral 勞工律師 45 →

Member, State Board of Equalization—1st District

WAYNE R. NYGREN, Libertarian
Businessman/Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos 商人／反稅收倡議人 49 →

WILLIAM H. "BILL" IVERS, Republican
California State Legislator/Legislador del Estado de California 加州立法人員 50 →

ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom
Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de Reforma de Impuestos 稅收改革倡議人 51 →

CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic
Superintendent of Education/Superintendente de Educación, Member, Board of Trustees/ Miembro del Consejo de Administradores, Members elected, los directos 州教育局第一區委任委員 52 →
### United States Senator

**Senador de Estados Unidos**

- **JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian**
  Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía
  54

- **EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic**
  Governor of California/Gobernador de California
  55

- **THERESA "TENA" DIETRICH, American Independent**
  Printer/Impresor
  56

- **DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom**
  Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingierimo Solar, Maestro
  57

- **PETE WILSON, Republican**
  Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego
  58

### Representative in Congress—5th District

**Diputado al Congress — Distrito #5**

- **JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian**
  Newspaper Editor/Editor (Redactor) de Periódico
  62

- **MILTON MARKS, Republican**
  State Senator 5th District/Senador Estatal, Distrito No. 5
  63

- **PHILIP BURTON, Democratic**
  Member of the United States Congress/Miembro del Congreso Estados Unidos
  64

### Member of the Assembly—19th Assembly District

**Miembro de la Asamblea — Distrito #19**

- **LES KELTING, Republican**
  Businessman-Taxpayers Advocate/Hombre de Negocios, Defensor del Contribuyente
  75

- **LOUIS J. PAPAN, Democratic**
  Member of the Assembly/Miembro de la Asamblea
  76

- **MARK PICKENS, Libertarian**
  Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist/Activista Contra la Conscripción/Contra Los Impuestos
  77
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANK K. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTO M. KAUS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN E. BROUSSARD</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUZ REYNOZO</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN T. RACANELLI</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH R. GRODIN</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN J. MILLER</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME A. SMITH</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINTON WAYNE WHITE</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Results:
- For Associate Justice of the Supreme Court
- For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
- For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
- For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
- For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
- For Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District
- For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District

- Yes/No votes: 79, 82, 85, 88, 91, 94, 97, 100, 103
- Votes: YES
For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Three

Shall BETTY BARRY-DEAL
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
YES/SI 105 →

¿Deberá BETTY BARRY-DEAL
ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?
NO 106 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Shall WINSLOW CHRISTIAN
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
YES/SI 108 →

¿Deberá WINSLOW CHRISTIAN
ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?
NO 109 →

For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Four

Shall MARC POCHE
be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?
YES/SI 111 →

¿Deberá MARC POCHE
ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?
NO 112 →

Judge of the Municipal Court, Office No. 1
Juez de la Corte Municipal, Oficina #1
Vote for One
Página 5

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY
Attorney/Abogada
116 →

ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI
Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal
117 →

Member, Board of Directors, BART District 8
Miembro, Junta Directiva, Distrito BART 8
Vote for One

ROBERT SILVESTRI
Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transportes
121 →

ROBERT BARNES
Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes
122 →

EUGENE GARFINKE
BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART
123 →

BOB CEARY
Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Cojefe Coordenador de Impuestos sobre Alcantarillado
124 →

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.
### Superintendent of Public Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL HONG</td>
<td>District School Superintendent</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON RILES</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARGARET CRIGHTON De OSUNA</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raices</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRA KOPF</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODONIA M. WILSON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSARIO ANAYA</td>
<td>President San Francisco Board of Education/P</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILIAM FELZER</td>
<td>Engineering Educator/Educador de Ingeniería</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE L. O'BRIEN</td>
<td>Free Schools - Economics Instructor/Escolar</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT A. Da PRATO</td>
<td>Physician, Educator/Médico, Educador</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LELAND MOGLEN</td>
<td>Hospital Administration, MS, J.D./Administración de Hospital, MS, J.D.</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLE MIGDEN</td>
<td>Administrator/Fiscal Planner/Planificadora Fiscal</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN S. WONG</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL ROSSELLI</td>
<td>Business Manager/Gerente de Negocios</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT E. BURTON</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT R. BACCI</td>
<td>Lawyer/Abogado</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL S. BERNICK</td>
<td>Professor/Agency Director/Profesor/Director de Agencia</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMAHON</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. “BELLE STARR” MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGISTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SQUIRHI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Secretaria de la Misión/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Mienia del Cielo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote for no more than Five
# Measure 1: State School Building Lease-Purchase Bond Law of 1982

This act provides for a bond issue of $500,000,000 to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>186 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>187 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Measure 2: County Jail Capital Expenditure Bond Act of 1981

This act provides for the construction, reconstruction, remodeling, and replacement of county jails and the performance of deferred maintenance thereon pursuant to a bond issue of $280,000,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>190 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>191 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Measure 3: Veterans Bond Act of 1982

This act provides for a bond issue of $450,000,000 to provide farm and home aid for California veterans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>194 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>195 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Measure 4: Lake Tahoe Acquisitions Bond Act

This act provides funding for the purchase of property in the Lake Tahoe Basin, which is necessary to prevent the environmental decline of this unique natural resource, to protect the waters of Lake Tahoe from further degradation, and to preserve the scenic and recreational values of Lake Tahoe. The amount provided by this act is $85,000,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>198 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>199 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Measure 5: First-Time Home Buyers Bond Act of 1982

This act provides for a bond issue of $200,000,000 to provide funds for financing housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR</th>
<th>202 →</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>203 →</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Measure 6: Public Pension Fund Investment

Permits Legislature authorizing larger percentage investments in specified types of common stock. Prescribes fiduciary investment standards. Fiscal impact: If implemented, could result in opportunities for increased earnings, accompanied by greater risk to the participating funds, which could entail capital losses to the funds.

<p>| YES | 206 → |
| NO  | 207 → |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Descripción</th>
<th>Justificación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ESTATAL DE BONOS DE COMPRA-ARRIENDO PARA LA CONSTRUCCIÓN DE ESCUELAS DE 1982.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $500,000,000 para la provisión de despliegue de capital para la construcción o mejora de escuelas públicas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE DESEMBOLSO DE CAPITAL PARA CARCEL DE CONDADO DE 1981.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y repuesto de cárcel de condado y la ejecución del mantenimiento diferido en las mismas en conformidad con una emisión de bonos de $280,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE VETERANOS DE 1982.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $450,000,000 para proporcionar asistencia en granjas y residencias para veteranos de California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE ADQUISICIONES DE LAKE TAHOE.</td>
<td>Esta acta provee financiación para la compra de propiedad en la Cuencia de Lake Tahoe, para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y proteger los valores placentarios de Lake Tahoe. La cantidad provista por esta acta es $85,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A favor</td>
<td>ACTA DE BONOS DE COMPRADORES DE CASAS POR PRIMERA VEZ DE 1982.</td>
<td>Esta acta permite una emisión de bonos de $260,000,000 para proporcionar fondos para la financiación de residencias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>INVERSIÓN DE FONDOS DE PENSION PÚBLICOS.</td>
<td>Permite a la Legislatura autorizar inversiones de porcentaje mayor en tipos prescritos de acciones comunes. Prescribe normas de inversión fiduciaria. Impacto fiscal: De ponerse en vigor, podría resultar en oportunidades para un aumento de utilidades, acompañadas por riesgo menor para los fondos participantes, lo cual podría acarrear pérdidas capitales para los fondos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
### GENERAL ELECTION — NOVEMBER 2, 1982

**TAXATION, REAL PROPERTY VALUATION.** Allows Legislature to exclude construction of specified fire sprinkler or alarm systems from "newly constructed" definition. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented: Unknown, local government loss of property tax revenues and increased appraisal costs. Unknown increased state costs to offset revenue losses of schools, community colleges, and, possibly, other local governments. Minor increased state income tax revenues due to lower property tax deductions.

| YES 211 | NO 212 |

**TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF FUNDS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE.** Changes limit and repayment bases from accruing "taxes" to anticipated "revenues". Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal impact. As described by Analyst, it could reduce interest costs of borrowing agency and, conversely, reduce interest normally otherwise earned by nonborrowing agency.

| YES 215 | NO 216 |

**SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS, NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS.** Authorizes provision of textbooks on a library-type loan basis to nonpublic school pupils under specified conditions. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state annual costs could exceed $4 million for similar program to 1980-81 in grades K-3, and $1 million in grades 9-12. Unknown administrative costs.

| YES 220 | NO 221 |

**UNIFYING SUPERIOR, MUNICIPAL, JUSTICE COURTS.** Legislature may provide for unification of courts within a county after county electors' majority vote. Fiscal impact: No impact until implemented. When implemented, state and/or county increased salary and retirement costs for judges elevated, and unknown administrative costs or savings, which could vary substantially between counties.

| YES 225 | NO 226 |

**BEVERAGE CONTAINERS.** Requires each have refund value of five cents or more that must be paid on return of empty container. Fiscal impact: Net fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could be reduced litter cleanup and solid waste disposal costs and an unknown increase or decrease in tax revenue collections. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

| YES 229 | NO 230 |

**NUCLEAR WEAPONS.** Requires Governor write President urging proposal to Soviets to jointly halt nuclear weapons testing, production, and development. Fiscal impact: No direct fiscal effect.

| YES 233 | NO 234 |
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

TASACION, VALORACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura actuar en la construcción de sistemas de estima ción de incendios por reciclaje automático o sistemas de alarma de la definición de "recarga controlada". Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuanes se instrumente: Péríodo desconocida para la población local del redivio de impuestos a la propiedad y un aumento en los costos de evaluación, una reducción en el costo estatal para combatir los ruidos de ruidos a las escuelas, universida des y actividades de gobierno. Un aumento menor en el redivio de impuestos estatales a la renta debido a reducciones en los redivios de impuestos a la propiedad.

地方政策暫時转移資金用作維修，修正限制，債違基準由應計“税制”改為“預期稅收”。財政影響：無直接財政影響。照分析員的評述，它可能減輕借款的機構所負擔的利息。反過來說，非借款機構則可賺取的利息則受到削減。

UNIFICACION DE TRIBUNALES SUPERIORES, MUNICIPALES Y DE MAGISTRADO. La Legislatura puede permitir la unificación de tribunales dentro de un condado previo un voto mayoritario por los electores del condado. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta instrumentarse. Al instrumentarse, los costos administrativos podrían encenderse por programas similares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo. Los costos administrativos desconocidos.

統一高等法院，地方法院與審判法院。若經縣選舉人多數票通過，州議會可以在縣內統一各法院。財政影響：在付諸實策後會發生影響。一旦付諸實施。州議會與經選民表決同意，要付予新課稅而新增稅與退休金的開支。行政費可能節省的經費，數目不詳，各縣可能差異很大。

RECIPIENTES DE BECHAS. Requiere que cada uno tenga un valor de reembolso de cinco centavos a más que debe ser pago al devolver el recipiente vacío. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta instrumentarse. Al instrumentarse, la venta de botellas de plástico se aumentarían y se obtendrían reducciones en los gastos de recolección de impuestos. Se ajustaría a las variaciones de las variables propuestas por el Analista.

飲料容器，規定退回的空罐，可獲得五分或五分以上的回扣價值。財政影響：經的財政影響不能確定，可能減少增加的清理費與固體廢料處理費，稅收的增減，數目不詳。請參閱立法分析員對有關差別的分析。

ARMS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador le escriba al Presidente para pedirle que prohíba un alto en conjunto de pruebas, producción y desarrollo de armas nucleares. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal directo.

核武器，要求州長寫信給總統，呼籲他向聯聯建議聯合禁止核武器的試驗、生產和部署。財政影響：無直接財政影響。
WATER RESOURCES. Adds statutes regarding interbasin conservation programs, allowed instream appropriations, Stanislaus River water uses, and critical groundwater overdraft regulation. Fiscal impact: Overall fiscal effect cannot be determined. Could result in $1.48 million annual costs for 6 years to State Water Resources Control Board; unknown planning, administrative and implementation costs; unknown litigation costs; unknown loss of power revenues; and unknown long-term savings in reduced costs to add new water. Analyst's estimate discusses factors involved.

YES 237 →
NO 238 →

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION. Repeals Legislature's power over reapportionment and establishes commission to reapportion legislative and equalization districts starting with 1984 elections. Fiscal impact: On assumptions of Analyst, increased state costs of $126,000 in 1983 and a comparable amount once every 10 years beginning in 1991.

YES 241 →
NO 242 →

GUNS. Requires registration of handguns. Limits number of handguns allowed in State. Prohibits absolute legislative ban on possession of firearms. Fiscal impact: Indeterminable impact. Would increase administrative costs reimbursed in whole or part by fees. Unknown impact on cost of maintaining criminal justice system. Could impact sales and income tax revenues. See Analyst's estimate for discussion of variables.

YES 245 →
NO 246 →

CITY & COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

A Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

YES 249 →
NO 250 →

B Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed 3/4 of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

YES 252 →
NO 253 →

C Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

YES 256 →
NO 257 →

D Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

YES 259 →
NO 260 →
RECURSOS HIDRÁULICOS. Agregue estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permite asignaciones para aguas fluyentes, usa el río Stanislaus y reglamentación del consumo excesivo crítico de aguas frutícolas. Impacto fiscal: No puedo determinar el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $1,48 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hídricos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativa o de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de mitigación; pérdida desconocida de réditos de erradicación de agricultura y altos desconocidos de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la edición de agua nueva. El cálculo del Analista detalla lectores que intervienen.

COMISION DE NUEVO PRORRATIDO. Abra el poder de la Legislatura sobre el nuevo prorrato y establece una comisión para realizar un nuevo proyecto de distritos legislativos y de igualización empatando con las elecciones de 1984. Impacto fiscal: Basado en presupuestos del Analista, habrá un aumento de costos anuales de $125,000 en 1985 y una cantidad comparable una vez cada 10 años empezando en 1991.


PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDONDO 市縣提案

¿Deberá establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Oficina para Quejas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de los ciudadanos sobre malas conductas de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

¿Deberá la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal, 200,000, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, exceder de la limitación de que los detalles de costos capitales no deben superar el 2% de cada $100 de costo, y en el momento de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

¿Deberá autorizarse a la Junta de Supervisores a emitir bonos y pagar a existentes o particulares a adquirir, construir, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para industrias, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con reembolsos por las partes particulares y sin crecer ninguna deuda o obligación sobre la Ciudad?

¿Deberá la ciudad subscribirse a los cámaras sobrevivientes de empresas de la misma forma en que la ciudad subscribiera a los empleados activos a jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Salud Público?

¿Deberá el gobierno de la ciudad de San Francisco adquirir o participar en la adquisición de propiedades que sean de interés público y que puedan ser mejoradas para fines públicos, y que se encuentren en el mismo distrito que la ciudad?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7 1/2% of the compensation of these employees?</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE SAN FRANCISCO
ELECCION GENERAL — 2 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1982

261 SI 贊成
262 NO 反對

E ¿Se deberá permitir el cónyuge sobreviviente, de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que esté recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión al casarse de nuevo después de los 60 años de edad?

ア退休制度内の成員の未亡配偶，目前可享受受補助金，如果他們在60歲後再婚，應否繼續享受這種補助金?

267 SI 贊成
268 NO 反對

G ¿Deberá pagarse a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?

ア每一市參議員應發給年薪$23,924元？

270 SI 贊成
271 NO 反對

H ¿Deberá formar un nuevo Plan de Jubilación a Incapacidad para miembros uniformados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1 de noviembre de 1982, teniendo los miembros de los planes actuales derecho a transferirse al nuevo plan?

ア警察局在1982年11月1日之後僱用的穿制服警員，應否設立新的退休計劃和殘障保障計劃？現任警員亦有權從現有的計劃轉移到新的計劃?

276 SI 贊成
277 NO 反對

J ¿Deberá pagárselas a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o deberá declarar tiempo libre del trabajo a razón de tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extras o por trabajar en días festivos, según lo solicite el oficial?

ア警員加班或在假日執行職務，應否每小時發給一小時半的薪資或僅只要求每日補回一個半的休假時間？

279 SI 贊成
280 NO 反對

K ¿Deberá la Junta de Supervisores tomar medidas enumeradas y hacer que se efectúe un estudio de factibilidad para lograr la propiedad pública de la empresa de servicio eléctrico en San Francisco, y presentar la adquisición de dicho servicio a los electores en la elección general celebrada luego de completar el estudio?

ア市參議會應否訂出各種步驟和目標，調查研究關於把舊金山電力收歸公有的可能性，並在調查研究完成之後，為取得該公共事業提交選民在普選中付諸表決？

282 SI 贊成
283 NO 反對

L ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco no construir rampas de acceso en la entrada a City Hall, bien sea la ubicada en la Calle Polk o la ubicada en Avenida Van Ness?

ア市政府大廈在橫街及閣街的入口處不修建通路是否應由舊金山市、縣政府的政策？

285 SI 贊成
286 NO 反對

M ¿Deberá ser la política de la Ciudad y Condado de San Francisco efectuar cambios de zonificación para permitir la construcción de un hotel privado en el área del Complejo Médico Parnassus Heights y el Centro Médico U.C., especificándose la propiedad para su ubicación?

ア為了批准在巴納薩斯岡醫療綜合大樓和加州大學醫療中心地區興建一座私營酒店，分區條例應作修改，並註明該事業的所在地，這是否應由舊金山市、縣政府的政策？
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS

ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS:
#16—Area East of _____ (solid lines)
#17—Area BETWEEN _____ (solid lines)
#19—Area WEST of _____ (solid lines)

SENATE DISTRICTS:
#3—Area NORTH of /////// (virgule lines)
#9—Area SOUTH of /////// (virgule lines)

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
#5—All the UNSHADED area
#6—All the SHADED area

BART DISTRICTS: See page 102
YOUR RIGHTS AS A VOTER
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Q—What officials will voters be choosing at this election?
A—The offices are listed on the Voter Selection Coupon printed on the back cover of this pamphlet. All the candidates are listed in the Sample Ballot (Page 3).

Q—What districts are there in San Francisco?
A—San Francisco has:
   • three State Assembly Districts (AD 16, 17, 19)
   • two State Senate Districts (SD 3, 8)
   • two United States Congressional Districts (CD 5, 6)
   See map elsewhere in this pamphlet.

Q—Do these districts belong just to San Francisco?
A—No. State Assembly District 19 is shared with San Mateo County.
   State Senate District 3 is shared with San Mateo County.
   State Senate District 8 is shared with Marin County.
   United States Congressional District 6 is shared with Marin County and the cities of Daly City and Vallejo.

Q—What about the United States Senator. Is there a district for this position?
A—No. California has two United States Senators. Each Senator represents the entire state.

Q—How can I tell which districts I live in?
A—See your sample ballot or you can call the Registrar of Voters at 558-3417.

Q—Why is there nothing in the Voters Information Handbook about the people who are state candidates in this election?
A—Because this handbook deals only with local candidates and propositions.

Q—When do I vote?
A—The election will be Tuesday, November 2, 1982. Your voting place is open from 7 A.M. to 8 P.M. that day.

Q—Can I vote if I know I will be away from San Francisco on election day?
A—Yes. You can vote early by:
   • going to the Registrar of Voters office in City Hall and voting there anytime beginning October 4, 1982 this year or
   • mailing in the application requesting an absentee ballot sent with this voters’ handbook.

Q—What shall I write when I ask for an absentee ballot?
A—You must write:
   • that you need to vote early
   • your address when you signed up to vote
   • the address where you want the ballot mailed
   • then sign your name, and also print your name underneath.

Q—When do I mail my absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters?
A—You can mail your absentee ballot back to the Registrar of Voters as soon as you want. You must be sure your absentee ballot gets to the Registrar of Voters by 8 P.M. on election day, November 2, 1982.

Q—Can I take time off from my job to go vote on election day?
A—Yes, if you do not have enough time outside of working hours. You must tell your employer 3 working days before election day that you need time off to vote. Your employer must give you up to two hours off either at the beginning or end of your working day.

Q—Where do I go to vote?
A—Your voting place is printed above your name and address sent with this Voters Handbook (back cover).

Q—What do I do if my voting place is not open?
A—Call 558-3061 or 558-3417.

Q—Can an election worker at the voting place ask me to take any test?
A—No.

Q—If I don’t know what to do when I get to my voting place, is there someone there to help me?
A—Yes. The election workers at the voting place will help you. If they can’t help you, call 558-3061.

Q—Can I have someone help me in the voting booth if I need help?
A—Yes, if you are a handicapped person, or if you have language difficulties.

Q—What do I do if I cannot work the voting machine?
A—Ask one of the election workers and they will help you.

Q—Can I take my sample ballot into the voting booth even if I’ve written on it?
A—Yes.

Q—Can I vote for someone whose name is not on the ballot?
A—Yes. This is called a “write-in.” If you want to and don’t know how, ask one of the election workers to help you. The vote will be counted only if the candidate has signed up with the Registrar of Voters at least 14 days before the election as a write-in candidate.

Q—What do I do if I am sick on election day?
A—Call 558-3061 for information.

IF YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS ON VOTING CALL THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS AT 558-3417.
WORDS YOU NEED TO KNOW
By Ballot Simplification Committee

Here are a few of the words that you will need to know:

ABSENTEE BALLOT — If you are going to be away on election day, or if you cannot get to the place where you vote because you are physically disabled, you can get a special ballot to fill out. This ballot is called an absentee ballot. You get this ballot from the Registrar of Voters at City Hall. See Page 103.

BALLOT — A list of candidates and propositions that you vote on.

BONDS OR NOTES — Contracts to borrow and repay money.

BUDGET — Planned expenditures for each City Department for the fiscal year.

CAPITAL COSTS — Expenditures for equipment and facilities.

CHALLENGE — Any citizen can ask an officer at the polls to challenge any voter if the citizen thinks the voter does not live at the address given on the registration form.

CHARTER — The Charter is the basic set of laws for the city government.

CHARTER AMENDMENT — The charter is the basic set of laws for the city government. A charter amendment changes one of those basic laws. It takes a vote of the people to change the charter. It cannot be changed again without another vote of the people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY — A declaration of policy asks a question. Do you agree or disagree with a certain idea? If a majority of the voters approve of a declaration of policy, it is the duty of the supervisors to carry out the policy.

FISCAL YEAR — A twelve month period for which the City plans the use of its funds. The City's fiscal year runs from July 1 through June 30.

INITIATIVE — This is a way for voters to put a proposition on the ballot for people to vote on. An initiative is put on the ballot by getting a certain number of voters to sign a petition.

MUNI REVENUE PRODUCING VEHICLES — Buses, streetcars and cable cars.

PETITION — A statement signed by voters who agree that a certain idea or question should be on the ballot.

PROPOSITION — This means anything that you vote on, except candidates. If it deals with the state government, then it will have a number — such as Proposition 1. If it deals with city government, it will have a letter — such as Proposition A.

 POLLING PLACE — The place where you go to vote.

ORDINANCE — A law of the city and county, which is passed by the Board of Supervisors or approved by the voters.

SUPERVISORS — Elected members of the governing legislative body for the City and County of San Francisco.

SCREENS: RIGHTS OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED VOTER
(Election Code Section 14234)

14234. Assistance to voter.

When a voter declares under oath, administered by any member of the precinct board at the time the voter appears at the polling place to vote, that the voter is then unable to mark a ballot, the voter shall receive the assistance of not more than two persons selected by the voter.

No person assisting a voter shall divulge any information regarding the marking of the ballot.

In those polling places which do not meet the requirements specified by the State Architect for accessibility by the physically handicapped, a physically handicapped person may appear outside the polling place and vote a regular ballot. Such person may vote the ballot in a place which is as near as possible to the polling place and which is accessible to the physically handicapped. A precinct board member shall take a regular ballot to such person, qualify such person to vote, and return the voted ballot to the polling place. In those precincts in which it is impractical to vote a regular ballot outside the polling place, absentee ballots shall be provided in sufficient numbers to accommodate physically handicapped persons who present themselves on election day. The absentee ballot shall be presented to and voted by a physically handicapped person in the same manner as a regular ballot may be voted by such person outside the polling place.
CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

ALFRED G. CHIANTIELLI

My age is 42
My occupation is Attorney
My education and qualifications are: Native San Franciscan from North Beach. Saint Ignatius (1957), USF (1961), Lincoln Law School (1967). Married, one son, Monterey Heights resident. Fifteen years trial experience, over 125 jury trials, 1,000 preliminary hearings, in every SF Municipal and Superior Court. Former Assistant Chief District Attorney, law instructor.


Judges: present; Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Dominique O'comedy, Albert Wallenberg, Frank Hart, Roy Wonder, Lucy Kelly McCabe, Maxine Chesney, Alex Saldamando, Lawrence Kay, Philip Moscone, Lillian Sing; Retired; John B. Molinari, Charles Renfrew, Robert Kane, Francis McCarty, S. Lee Vavuris, Byron Arnold, Raymond Reynolds, Samuel Yee, Mary Moran Pajalich, Albert Axelrod.

Court Commissioners: Richard Best, Ronald Quidachay.


---

E. Patricia Lacey

FOR MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGE

PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY

My age is 57
My occupation is Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: Brown University; San Francisco State; Hastings Law; Experience on bench, at trial, in life.

Assistant Commissioner, judge pro tempore, San Francisco Superior Court; Referee San Francisco Juvenile Court; Deputy District Attorney, Contra Costa County. Teacher, Galileo High and Galileo Adult Schools, newspaper reporter, PBX operator, waitress, clerical, factory worker.


My sponsors are deliberately limited to San Franciscans with personal knowledge of my work in Court: former Executive Officer, San Francisco Superior Court; Juvenile Justice Commissioners; a Governor of the State Bar; former Juvenile Court Referee; courtroom clerks, reporters, bailiffs; and those San Franciscans who have had knowledge of my character for 15 to 30 years: Elsie Allen, Robert Anino, Robert Buckley, Samuel Carpenter, Christine Cassidy, Joan Catelli, Marjorie Childs, Daniel Flanagan, Kathleen Garfano, Zora Cheever Gross, Ruth Church Gupta, Michael Hallinan, Frances Hancock, Ed Heiser, Janet Karesh, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perino, James Purcell, Jose Reinoso, Paula Schmidt, Betty Tansey, Frances Verducci, John Wahl, Bernard Ward, Felton Williams, Bernard Wolf, Shirley Yawitz, Yori Wada, Juvenile Justice, U.C. Regent.

---

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
FOR BART DIRECTOR

ROBERT BARNES

My occupation is Law Librarian

My education and qualifications are: I have specific ideas for BART's improvement and the energy and skills to make them happen. I'm concerned about BART safety and San Francisco's need for adequate parking. The incumbent has been totally nonproductive and ineffective in protecting San Francisco taxpayers. Like the Reagan administration the incumbent has no clear ideas for the future of mass transportation. I am determined to actively pursue issues such as a combination BART/Muni Fastpass. I can bring together neighborhoods, business and labor to develop reasonable growth and expansion of the system.

As a board member of San Francisco Tomorrow, I have researched and addressed important urban issues facing the city. Having worked in both banking and law, I have a firm grasp of economics. My involvement in a broad range of community-based activities and organizations has uniquely prepared me for a seat on the BART Board.

I'm a native San Franciscan, educated at Lowell High and City College and a lifelong user of public transportation. I am confronted daily with the problems all transit riders experience.

My supporters include Supervisors Hongisto, Ward, Nelder, Silver, Walker, and Kennedy, Sheriff Hennessey, Lia Belli and Party Chairman Agar Jaicks.

Robert Barnes

FOR BART DIRECTOR

BOB GEARY

My age is 42

My occupation is Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman, County Central Committeeman, Police Officer, Educator

My education and qualifications are: Recipient of four Medals of Valor — two for disarming suspects, one for saving a drowning victim and one for saving a burning victim — BART commuter Bob Geary is a much decorated veteran of the San Francisco Police Department, dedicated to protecting BART riders from violent crime in/around stations. Earning a B.A. from St. Mary's College; Master's Degree and Teaching Credential from USF; distinguished himself as an Army Transportation Officer. As Chairman of Citizens to Stop the Sewer Tax and twice handily elected County Central Committeeman he has long experience in fighting government waste and now he wants to clean up BART.

Incumbent Garfinkle has persistently ignored the interests and concerns of San Franciscans. During his tenure in office:

— He has not made himself available to commuters.
— No BART Board Meetings have ever been held in San Francisco.
— Nothing has been done to cure the terrible crime and parking problems that plague BART riders.
— Transfers have been arranged for East Bay commuters but not for Muni riders.
— Garfinkle has serious conflict of interest problems from service on Southern Pacific's payroll as Railroad Attorney. Southern Pacific wants to eliminate its commuter service by extending BART — dumping its multimillion dollar headache on us.

Bob Geary

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.

To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR BART, DISTRICT #8

FOR BART DIRECTOR
EUGENE GARFINKLE

My age is 53
My occupation is President, Board of Directors BART and Business Lawyer
My education and qualifications are: As a director since 1977 I have worked hard to provide strong leadership as an officer and now President to help BART achieve: (1) fiscal stability; (2) respectable labor contracts and salaries; (3) consistent and reliable operations; (4) 50% passenger increase to 190,000 per day without increasing personnel; (5) recognition as one of the safest and best operating systems in the nation.

BART must provide patrons first rate service by reasonable and cost effective expenditures to protect taxpayer-owners. I seek re-election to continue my constructive efforts to thus manage and improve this $5 billion system. BART must continue to improve service, expand capacity and extend its lines. BART’s current major capital program will accomplish this but only with qualified and dedicated directors.

I am a graduate of the University of California and its law school, have a Business Administration Masters Degree and 25 years experience as a San Francisco transportation and business lawyer. I am a member of the Transportation Task Force — San Francisco Strategic Plan, the Transportation Committee — San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, SPUR, a Bay Area native, a homeowner, a BART-MUNI commuter. My community supporters include: Mayor Dianne Feinstein, President-Board of Supervisors Quentin L. Kopp, Supervisors John L. Molinari and Lee S. Dolson, Senator John F. Foran and Honorable Cyril Magnin.

Eugene Garfinkle

NOTE

Not all voters receiving this pamphlet are in BART District #8. BART Districts #7 and #9 have no candidates up for election this year.
To determine if your precinct is in BART District #8 please consult the BART map on page 102.

FOR BART DIRECTOR
ROBERT SILVESTRI

My age is 40
My occupation is Transportation Engineering Consultant
My education and qualifications are: Central Committeeman Robert Silvestri co-authored a major mass transit book.

Issues:
— San Francisco Board of Supervisors majority opposes Eugene Garfinkle re-election.
— Trying to avoid the public, Garfinkle holds BART Board meetings at 9 a.m. on weekdays — in Oakland.
— Raising BART fares, Garfinkle said: “The people don’t care.”
— “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle failed to deal with growing violent crime and terrible parking problems around San Francisco BART stations.
— Garfinkle strongly supported the 1979 re-election of ex-District Attorney Joseph Freitas, whom Arlo Smith overwhelmingly defeated. Freitas was politically allied to leftist San Francisco mass killer Jim Jones (Peoples Temple 1978 murder-suicide of nearly 1,000 people, Jonestown, Guyana).
— Silvestri endorses Senator Milton Marks for Congress. Garfinkle supports controversial Phillip Burton.
— Silvestri favors police “decoy” operations to trap violent criminals around San Francisco BART stations.
— Consulting French-Alexandrian engineer Charles Salloum (listed: Who’s Who In Technology), Silvestri has developed proven, revenue-producing plans for elevator-aided highrise parking near San Francisco BART stations.
— East Bay commuters have bus transfers to BART, but strangely Garfinkle blocked such transfers for San Francisco Muni users.
— For years “Do-Nothing” Garfinkle sat, while BART trains had inflammable seats — emitting poison gas when they exploded in flames.

Robert Silvestri

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

SISTER BOOM BOOM

My address is 2101 California St.
My occupation is Nun of the Above
My qualifications for office are: Divine inspiration; I'm a fifth-generation San Franciscan, and notoriously tight-fisted.


Poverty taught me more about economy that most incumbents will learn. Goddess knows money helps, but problems are solved through creative innovation.

Insane? That's what people said about Columbus. A queen took a chance on him — take a chance on this queen. It's the American way!

Am I supe yet?

Sister Boom Boom

The Sponsors for Sister Boom Boom are:
Bill Graham, 231 Ashbury, Staffing Coordinator
Richard Stokes, 3917-22nd St., Clerk
Nina Glaser, 1500 Diamond, Photographer
Randy Schell, 566 Fell, Client Advocate Specialist
James P. "Jays" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hook, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Gilbert Baker, 2801 Bush St., Theatrical Designer
Mary Doyle, 4044-24th St., Nurse
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Reform Activist
Paul E. Brown, 60 Dearborn, Cosmetologist
Michael F. Davis, 1083 Lombard, Antique Dealer
Christianna H. Keith, 525-8th Ave., Funk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apothecary Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristal, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave., Blood Spinner
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St., Nun of the above
Stuart A. Gurtman, 232 Liberty, Account Clerk
Ronald Jackson, 21 Moffit St., Security Guard
Larry G. Jett, 1320 Sutter, Law Clerk
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister, Clerk

RICHARD BRADLEY

My address is 1726 Grove Street
My occupation is Building Maintenance Mechanic
My age is 32

Richard Bradley

The Sponsors for Richard Bradley are:
John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter
Jacquelyn E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman
Karen Coshak, 2825 Bush St., Office Worker
William D. Edwards, 119 Garfield St., Cab Driver
Diana Coleman, 603 Kansas St., Letter Carrier
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Carlee M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Eric Gooby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physicist
Katherine G. Ikehara, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student
Brian F. Post, 322 Angus, Phone Worker
Wanda Rutland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl, Letter Carrier
Alan K. Thomason, 1301 Leavenworth, Student
Michael C. Welte, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
OFFICIAL NOTICE

AN ERROR APPEARS ON PAGE 42
ALL VOTERS SHOULD READ THIS WARNING

Because of a printer's error the lists of sponsors for Community College Board candidates John Riordan and Sal Rosselli, appearing on page 42, have been placed under the wrong candidate.

Sal Rosselli's sponsors have been listed under John Riordan's statements of qualifications and John Riordan's sponsors have been listed under Sal Rosselli's statement of qualifications.

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:

Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrer, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp. App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Idora Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary J. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Reallors
Robert DeVries, 351B-29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airways Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Potheodore Kilt, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.

Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Genevieve Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margaret Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 788-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tobriner, 472 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Moesada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:

Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 288 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boscette, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblitz, 10-9th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waler St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskvitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouyy, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3221-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Donnely Vukovich, 177 Aleco, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yorita Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Muneca Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilritos, Minister
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

DIANA COLEMAN

My address is 603 Kansas Street  
My occupation is Letter Carrier  
My age is 36

My qualifications for office are: Supporter Spartacist, labor/socialists who organized stopping Nazi celebration of Hitler's birthday, San Francisco 1980. Union militant, six years CWA. Member National Association Letter Carriers. Break with — build a workers' party! Strike action to bring down Reagan! No gun control — labor/black defense against Klan/Nazi terror! For massive public works under union control! Jobs for all, decent housing, free medical care, childcare, education, transit! Full equality — minorities, women, homosexuals! Citizenship rights for undocumented workers! From Afghanistan to Poland to El Salvador — down with Reagan's anti-Soviet war drive! Throw out the capitalists! Seize banks, industry — no compensation! Establish workers' government

Diana Coleman

GREG DAY

My address is 287 Downey Street  
My occupation is Human Rights Activist, Journalist

My qualifications for office are: I worked for human rights reform and coalition between San Francisco's ethnic communities for: an end to police brutality ... safer neighborhoods ... stronger rent control ... affordable housing ... control downtown growth ... employment for city residents.


As a citizen supervisor I will continue work for responsible police services, better housing, comparable worth, a fair share of city jobs, social services for women, gay, black, latino, asian and other underrepresented citizens.

Greg Day

The Sponsors for Diana Coleman are:

John M. Albert, 3320-22nd St., Carpenter  
Richard Bradley, 1726 Grove St., Building Maintenance Mechanic  
Jacqueline E. Clark, 1335-16th Ave., Warehouseman  
Carole M. Ferguson, 5-27th St., Medical Assistant  
Karen Coshak, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker  
Paul B. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker  
William D. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver  
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprenticeship Plant Operator  
Michael L. Golden, 1391 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk  
Eric Goosby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician  
Stephen C. Gonzales, 246 Wheeler, Phone Worker  
Katherine G. Ikemami, 600 Kansas, Phone Worker  
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist  
Todd Nolan, 225-14th, Proofreader  
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th St., Student  
Brian D. Pest, 322 Mangel's, Phone Worker  
Wanda Raulland, 3116 Geary Blvd., Phone Worker  
Ruth E. Ryan, 355 Serrano Dr., Hospital Clerk  
Steven A. Siegel, 200 Carl St., Letter Carrier  
Alan R. Thomsen, 1301 Leavenworth St., Student  
Michael C. Welle, 5-27th St., Printer  
Brian James Wilson, 3531-16th St., Production Technician  
Evelyn M. Wyatt, 39 Scott St., Phone Worker

The Sponsors for Greg Day are:

Tom Ammarino, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher  
Eddie Baca, 790 Church St., Vice Pres. Latino Club  
Konstantin Berlandt, 106 Eureka St., Journalist  
Barbara M. Cameron, 590-5th Ave., Data Processing  
Madeleine Carter, 2516-21st St., Bar Manager  
Kim Corsaro, 472 Sanchez St., Newspaper Editor  
Bob Cramer, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards  
Mary C. Dunlap, 421 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher  
Eileen Gillis, 250 McCauley St., Human Rights Commission Specialist  
Rom Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator  
Claire M. Harris, 5478-18th St., Photographer  
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant  
Leslie A. Manning, 18 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant  
Bill Matsimoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk  
Louise A. Minnick, 656 Cole St., County Central Committee  
Pati Norman, 319 Richland, Dept. of Public Health Administrator  
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., S.F. Marijuana Activist  
Arthur W. Simons, 3 Romain St., Foundation Manager  
Tom Specht, 91 Seward St., Real Estate Sales  
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator  
Rikki Streichert, 1000 Shrader St., Corporate Executive  
Vaughn Taylor, 3622-16th St., Pres. Eureka Valley Promotion Assoc.  
Carmen Velazquez, 114 Steiner St., Member, S.F. Women's Center Board  
Tom Waddell, M.D., 141 Albion St., Physician  
Howard L. Wallace, 763-14th St., Trade Unionist  
Tom Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Community College Board  
Sue Zemel, 463-14th St., Writer

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JERRY R. De YOUNG

My address is 78 Sanchez #4
My occupation is Word Processor
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: After serving six years in the U.S. Navy in the communications field, before being honorably discharged, and working in the private sector in the same field for an additional 19 years, my ability to analyze facts, and figures, fact and fiction, has been honed to a very fine degree.

This past experience, complimented by a natural concern for social welfare, endows me with an extraordinary capacity to serve the best interest of the public in an exemplary fashion.

Honesty, integrity and a ceaseless urge to become an effective instrument utilized for the implementation of public will qualifies me even beyond experience.

Jerry R. DeYoung

The Sponsors for Jerry R. DeYoung are:
Edward Carmick, 114 Lyon St., Clerk
Grady J. Clark, 4347A-20th St., Shippmg & Receiving Clerk
Andres Colon, 69 Webster St. Sr. Offset Operator
Patrick Conlon, 940 Lawton St., Bookkeeper
Albert P. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2607 Post St., Claims Adjuster
Lawrence M. Grant, 1826-15th St., Credit Union Mgr.
Leslie H. Gundel, 140 Duboce St., Psychiatric Technician
Timothy Wayne Hagerman, 1852 Fell St., Administrative Asst.
J.L. Harden, 525 Fillmore St., Bartender
Rodney A. Hilaire, 88 Watertown St., Distribution & Attd Sr.
Lowell Hills, 110 Hancock St., Grocery Clerk
Ronald D. Kirk, 66 Elgin Pk., Accountant
Douglas W. Quate, 217 Dolores St., Administrative Management
Ray Reza, 115A Duboce St., Legal Asst/Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395A Hayes St., Computer Operator
Dennis R. Singleton, 180 Duboce St., Prep. Cook
James C. Stumbersky, 3227 Market St., Finance Administrator
Mary Ann Torres, 151 Gough St., Cashier
Frank Walker, 484 Eureka St., Stat Typist
Harold Weisbecker, 42 Summer St., Manager, Retail Sales
Billy G. West, 2371-15th St., Marketing
Ferdinand C. Wheeler, 1420 Balboa, Cargo Agent
Allan G. Winkie, 69 Webster St., Offset Operator

LEE S. DOLSON

My address is 172 Portola Drive
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors


Records: Since 1972, helped cut millions from inflationary, unnecessary public spending. Demanded cost-effective, increased police and fire protection, improved Muni services, and safer, cleaner streets. Actively pushed for increased jobs, stronger economic climate, and better, affordable housing for every San Franciscan.

Priorities: Improve spending controls: Fair-share delivery of vital services to every neighborhood; Increase job opportunities; Build unity throughout San Francisco.

Lee S. Dolson, Ph.D.

The Sponsors for Lee S. Dolson are:
Joseph L. Allott, 133 Jones St., Attorney, Former Mayor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Robert F. Barry, 310S Octavia St., President, Police Officers Assoc.
Morris Bernstein, 1724 Broadway, Investor
Raymond J. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruscher, 537-50th Ave., Secretary, Firefighters Union
S. Edward Cala, 3124 Fulton St., Grocer
William H. Chester, 432 Goldmine Dr., Labor Management Consultant
William J. Chow, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor San Francisco
R.W. Coonradt, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlotta Tenor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Service Comm.
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
James T. Ferguson, 1850 Powell St., President, Firefighters Local 798
Terry A. Francois, 20 Taraval St., Attorney, Former Supervisor
JoAnn Hendricks, 3200-31st Ave., Environmental Consultant CCSF
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner, Former Supervisor
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific Ave., U.S. Postmaster Retired
Frances M. McKeever, 130 South A Ave., Housewife
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific Ave., Managing Partner Investment Firm
Lucio C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thomas A. Reed, 52, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samaraz, 264 Dalewood Way, Union Official
Thomas C. Scallon, 651 Vicente St., City & County Treasurer Retired
Joseph E. Tinney, 1 Melba Ave., Attorney at Law, Retired S.F. Assessor
Stanley Smith, 411 Fulton St., Labor Union Official
Jefferson Wilson, 47 Digny St., U.S. Postmaster, San Francisco
Benny Y. Yee, 351 Marina Blvd., Realtor

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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MARTIN LEE ENG

My address is 665 Pine Street, Penthouse Suite
My occupation is Merchant/Bible Preacher
My age is 29

My qualifications for office are: B.A., C.P.A., real estate broker, Master Divinity candidate, frequent traveler.

My lips shall not speak wickedness. A great city, or is it also a lunatic, sin capital of the world? Time is short.

I am not a politician, and will serve for one-term only. Fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget are the keys.

Most of you might be angry with my views. But I warn everyone dearly, it is for your sake to have me elected.

Break the tradition that campaigning and name-recognition are needed.

All my affiliates are not responsible for my platform.

Martin Eng can win!  

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:

Ted Aksnes, 1882 Green St., Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 15 Vandewater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Belli, Sr., 2950 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1125 Taylor St., Real Estate Sales
Jim M. Fong, 1134 Clay St., Insurance Broker/Investor
Rebecca Ford, 515 Pierce St., Real Estate Sales
Gordon C. Gong, 665 Pine St., Nuclear Scientist
B.F. Herman III, 128 Carl St., Real Estate Investor
Flora Jayne Larkey, 41 Rudden Ave., Teacher
Michael T. McDonald, 1735 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Owner
Kevin Molinari, 2247-26th Ave., Real Estate Salesman
John Tracey O'Loughlin, 1922 Broderick St., Businessman
Velma Petersilie, 665 Pine, Teacher
Edward K. Pond, 5049 Anza, Businessman
John B. Ritchie, 2 Presidio Terrace, Property Owner;
Member, Landmark Preservation Board
A.L. Rosenthal, 159 Marina Blvd., Retired
Richard Scott, 386 Lily St., Maintenanceman
D. Scherer, 1731 Vallevjo, Broker/University instructor
Michael Strausz, 2860 Laguna St., Union Real Estate Brokerage
Robin Tom, 28 Annapolis, Branch Manager (Savings & Loan)
Priscilla J. Trujillo, 375-19th Ave., Real Estate Salesperson
Benjamin Wong, 519-12th Ave., Clergy/Reverend
Lawrence Wong, 1001 Pine St., Restaurant Manager
Samuel Wong, 615 Broadway, Retired
Dr. John H. Wu, 2334-25th Ave., Physician/Internal Medicine
Albert Yung, 989 Filbert St., System Engineer

KENNETH L. FARMER

My address is 1273A South Van Ness Avenue
My age is 43

My qualifications for office are: My belief that I possess sufficient intelligence, common sense, enthusiasm for the job and compassion for my fellow human beings and over all a true love of San Francisco (and a horror over what is being done by current administrators) to institute needed reforms in city government so that working class, Blacks, Orientals, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Elderly and Young People who now have no friends at city hall will have a voice in city politics. As a Black, gay male living in the Mission, I know many problems first hand, and believe that I have proper motivation to become a supervisor.

Kenneth L. Farmer

The Sponsors for Ken Farmer are:

Norman Armentrout, 108 Haight St., Leaflet Distributor
Eula M. Bell, 420 Baker St., Beauty Shop Operator
Paullette Belleveau, 1271 S. Van Ness Ave., Data Clerk
Jaret L. Burdine, 420 Eddy St., Cook
Elizabeth Cobbs, 652 Peralta Ave., Clothing Store Owner
Irma Crenshaw, 559 Waller St., Store Owner
Thomas T. Dalton, 108 Haight St., Bartender
Howard E. Davis, 1354 Dolores, Actor/Teacher
Harry P. Elliot, 989 Haight St., Gardener
Harold L. Gage, 1360 Hyde St., Payroll Specialist
Cathy Kornblith, 951 Alabama, Investigator
Esther Lee, 1325 Laguna, Mgr., Laundry
J.E. Malone, 421 Haight St., Store Owner
Darrell L. McClure, 768 Clementina, Systems Administrator
David Pitts, 1561 Pine St., Artist
Alan Ross, 418 Haight St., Upholsterer
Clarence B. Shields, 1135 Laguna, Teacher
LeRoy E. Shoenmaker, 1275 S. Van Ness, Paralegal
Linda Trunzo, 559 Haight, Glass Finisher
Darrell White, 324 Bartlett St., Houseman
CANDIDATES FOR SUPERVISOR

RICHARD D. HONGISTO

My address is 65 Wood Street
My occupation is Full time Supervisor
My age is 45

My qualifications for office are: I bring the Board twenty years of government service and extraordinary administrative experience:
— Policeman for 10 years,
— Sheriff, elected twice,
— Commissioner of prison system,
— Finance Committee, Vice-Chair, SF Supervisor.

My experience gives me necessary tools for facilitating the most effective, pragmatic approach to problems facing government. An Examiner analysis of Board members ranks me #2. This reflects not only my experience and expertise, but also the commitment I have to my position.

I'm concerned with issues affecting our daily life: public safety, employment, affordable housing, efficient use of government money, preserving cultural activities, better transportation, and a clean city.

Richard D. Hongisto

The Sponsors for Richard Hongisto are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Pres. Community College Board
Lia Triff Belli, 2950 Broadway, Pres. California Council
Morris Berstein, 740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner/Businessman
Al Borvice, 234 Gutes St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agripino R. Cerbistas, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Canoe, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Bellsie Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Director. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jess T. Esteva, 5259 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessen, 460 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzstein, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchen, 4176-20th St., Commissioner on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention Commissioner
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. of S.F. Public Library Commission
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lai, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
William S. Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
Harold D. Madison, 1250 Shafter Ave., Retired
John L. Molinaro, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Kira Z. Nelson, 30 Homestead St., College Student
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
W.P. O'Keefe Sr., 44 Corbett Ave., Pres., S.F. Taxpayers Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 287-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Peet, 350 Arballo Drive, Clergy
Clare C. Pilcher, 471 Hoffman Ave., Director, Board of Permit Appeals
Thelma Shelley, 70 Eversen, Facilities Management
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent
Samuel Wright, 195 Terra Vista Ave., Retired
Dr. Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor

ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES

My address is 981 Shotwell St.
My occupation is Handyman and Criminology Student
My age is 55

My qualifications for office are: At the present time I am attending City College of San Francisco with an AA degree in sight. I have been a concerned father of the Mission community for twenty-one years and know the value of keeping the district organization alive and full of service to the people and to help work for social change.

During the spring months I was a volunteer counselor at Project New Pride, a program of the American Red Cross. Also in the past I have worked with many other agencies that serve the youth of the city.

Andrew Jones

The Sponsors for Andrew "Daddy Andy" Jones are:
Jack Bourke, 1426 Florida, Executive Director, Mission Housing Development Corp.
Timothy Jones, 981 Shotwell St., Recreation Director
Peggy Hall, 702 Andover St., Councilor
David L. Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Salesman
Helen Butler, 991 Shotwell St., Housewife
Pinskey Andrea, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmanita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Retired
Joseph F. Martinez, 274 Lowell St., Executive Director
Jose F. Hernandez, 66 Vina, Accountant
Virginia Sheldon, 1275 Hampshire St., Administrative Secretary
Lorenzo Richard Dill, 365 Nevada St., Educational Coordinator
R. Ashley Cohn, 1331-11th Ave., Attorney
Janet Showers, 997 Shotwell St., Housewife, Mother
Alice McDonnell, 372 Capp, Intake Interviewer
Rose Macellari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Detor
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dottie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Prentas, Legal Secretary
Joseph L. Rodriguez, 2779-21st St., Law Clerk
Rachelle Cotonerader, 215 St. Charles, Letter Carrier
Wilfredo A. Garcia, 1504 Capp St., Self-employed
David Gonzalez, 1522-19th Ave., Disabled
Abby Rodriguez, 1418 Florida St., Social Services Coordinator
Jay Smith, 472 Clipper St., Landlord

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ELLIS LEONARD
ANTHONY KEYES

My address is 443 Broadway
My occupation is Musician, Composer
My qualifications for office are: I am a common person, raised and educated in San Francisco. I want San Francisco to have more affordable housing. I want more jobs for the young and elderly citizens of San Francisco, more jobs so that the welfare burden will be reduced. I want San Francisco government to become more honest and responsive to our needs. I want San Francisco streets safe, for all good people to walk. I want better schools with more music and fine art, to maintain our San Francisco tradition of trend setting.

Please give me the opportunity to serve you and try to solve our problems.

Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes

The Sponsors for Ellis Leonard Anthony Keyes are:
Enrico Banducci, 1050 Green St., Restaurant Owner
Ness A. Aquino, 220-23rd St., Restaurant Owner
Lenore Cautrelle, 1556 Clay, Retired Pac-Tel
Christeen M. Berges, 2279 Bryant St., Housewife
Claudia L. Weems, 189 Precita, Foster Parent
Ginger Coleman, 734 Bush, Editor
Jose Bernsten, 375-29th St., Marine Machinist
Roger E. Miller, 2231-15th St., Student
James Husted, 333 Geary St., Electronics
Michael D. Helland, 450 A Vallejo, Construction Worker
Emmanuel Sobieski, 1745 Broadway, Security Manager
Sandra D. Parks, 147 Kingston, Railway Worker
Theresa D. Ward, 905 Columbus, Silk Screen Printer
Paul B. Matlock, 526-6th Ave., Musician
Jean Weems, 189 Precita, Musician
John Pappadakis, 3241 Taraval, Doorman
Naomi Ruth Eisenberg, 980 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Paupore, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barker
Tana Lynn Lemmons, 527-3rd St., Waitress
Julie R. Brown, 331 Willard North, Pre School Teacher
Suzanne Roche, 2411 Webster St., Manager Shoe Boutique
Mark Greenspun, 2721 Pacific, Electronic Technician

JULIAN LAGOS

My address is 577 Arballo
My occupation is Urban Planner
My qualifications for office are: Ringling Bros. couldn't do a better job. Circus acts, such as the recent handgun ban, make San Francisco the laughing stock of America. Our supervisors have hula-hooped the City into a $2 billion sewer project, an $80 million Muni overhaul, a $156 million budgetary surplus, and a severe case of governmental dyslexia. Any American city that deprives its' citizens of affordable housing, affordable utilities, and dignity, while getting fat at the expense of parkers and bus riders, needs a house cleaning. Eliminating bureaucratic neuroses, instituting a tenant-landlord collective agreement, and buying PG&E is what the doctor orders. Elect me.

Julian Lagos

The Sponsors for Julian A. Lagos are:
Jay Adams, 1956 Lombard, Unemployed
Scherrie Rae Athon, 440 Geary, Psychologist
James C. Anderson, 203 Randall, Cab Driver
John Beazley, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Elizabeth Bedford, 508 Andover, Attorney
Ed Bennett, 2440 Van Ness, Cab Driver
John W. Blethen, 1460 Haight, Attorney
Kathryn Bobrowski, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Margaret Burns, 417 Stockton, Unemployed
Morris J. Commer, 3042 San Bruno Ave., Retired
Mark S. Emery, 553 Taylor, Artist
James Fisher, 2240 Fillmore, Cab Driver
Stanley Allen Grumet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 DeHaro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 4118A-24th St., Service Manager
Patrick McMahon, 1515 Sutter, Cab Driver
Joe Miller, 739 Elizabeth, Cab Dispatcher
Victor E. Miller, 70 Liberty, Consultant
Ruth Motes, 2317 Folsom, Postal Worker
Stephen A. Schotman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guerrero, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 Page, Legal Worker
Hayes Wiseley, 417 Stockton, Messenger

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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BILL MAHER
My address is 2260 - 9th Avenue
My occupation is Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education; attorney
My age is 35
My qualifications for office are: Attorney — USF Law School; Commissioner, San Francisco Board of Education since 1976; President for two consecutive terms. During that time, school test scores have improved from last to first among California's major cities.

Today, despite major cutbacks, schools are academically sound, better integrated, and better managed.

The long-term financial base of the City is uncertain. We must breach the alienation between downtown and neighborhood interests, maintain basic services such as police, roads, libraries and public transportation, and end the excessive, unproductive bickering of the current Board.

I have years of experience in helping to solve these types of problems.

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Betty Ann McMahon are:
Irene Antoni, 2643 Greenwich St., Teacher
James D. Curriwan, 2550 Irving, Funeral Director
Elizabeth Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Housewife
Frank C. Doherty, 2443-22nd Ave., Retired Administrator - Union
Wm. A. Flading, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Attorney
Josephine Flanagan, 1798 Bush, Housewife
Peter L. Forstlind, Retired - Electrical Contractor
Josephine B. Honn, 2322 Union St., Consultant S.F. Unified School District
Thomas F. McDonough, 1562-38th Ave., Retired
John McMahon, 880 Portola Dr., Accountant
Frances Mae Melanie, 123 Junipita Way, Retired
Joseph L. Muserac, 2353 Funston Ave., Retired Recreation Supt.
Vincent J. Mullins, 3383 Washington, Lawyer
Francis J. Murphy, 2155-9th Ave., Engineer
Carlos Palacios, 186 St. Elmo Way, Shipping
Greg Rocco, 175 Landsdale Ave., Accountant
James V. Rocco, 175 Landsdale Ave., Mechanical Engineer
Jerome Sapio, 66 Sotelo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shinn, 2 San Marcos Ave., Stationary Engineer
Lavita G. Smith, 870 Portola Dr., Retired - Accountant
Roberta Steward, 181 Addison, Admissions Coordinator
Daniel F. Sullivan, 2724 Yorba St., Real Estate Broker
Gertrud Vorderwinkler, 255 Shrader St., Nurses Aide
James T. Ward, 220 Buckingham Way, Retired
Vincent A. Valen, 160 Hernandez Ave., Administrator, Blood Bank

Betty Ann McMahon

The Sponsors for Bill Maher are:
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., Pres. S.F. Board of Education
Henry E. Berman, 483 Euclid Ave., Fire Commissioner
Susan Bierman, 1529 Shadr, Planning Commissioner
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Cooper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Coblnetz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Arthur Coleman, M.D., 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
Dorman L. Common, 155 Jackson St., Business Executive
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Board Member, Y.W.C.A.
Jess T. Esteva, 2585 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
George Evankovich, 1644A Fillbert St., Pres. Laborer's Union
George Foss, 1750 Taylor St., President, Department Store
Anne W. Halsed, 1308 Montgomery St., Neighborhood Activist
Michael Hennebesy, 1409 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Walter St., P.U.C. Administrator
Caryl Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mishak, 1815-8th Ave., Board Member,
Nat'l Women's Political Caucus
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Eugenia Moscone, 45 St. Francis Blvd., Homemaker
W.F. O'Keefe, Sr., 944 Corbett Ave., Pres. S.F. Taxpayer's Assoc.
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ronn, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet H. Weinstein, 1080 Francisco, Retired
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist, Pres. Asian Inc.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., U.C. Regent

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ERIC MONCUR
My address is 1866 Great Highway
My occupation is Businessman
My qualifications for office are: Vice President of the Henry George School of Economics, Real Estate Consultant, former San Francisco Deputy Assessor, Activist for human rights and economic justice. Background in economics, public administration and urban problems.

The ownership of over 95 percent of our land by less than 3 percent of the population is the underlying cause of unemployment, housing shortages, stagnation and crime in our cities. This can be reversed by removing taxes from buildings and have a land value tax only. Land speculators and slumlords will be forced to sell or build homes freed from taxes to improve homes. This creates jobs, homes and peace.

Eric Moncur

K. F. "BELLE STARR" MOSELEY
My address is 2120 Market St., Apt. 103
My occupation is Lawyer and Artist
My age is 32
My qualifications for office are: I am a 7th generation Californian, and 2nd generation San Franciscan. I have attended U.C. Berkeley (English and genetics), San Francisco State University (M.A. communications) and the University of San Francisco Law School. I produce free concerts in parks.

My job as supervisor will be to create and coordinate places where your opinions and solutions to our city's problems can be collected and where I can communicate what the other supervisors are considering.

I am willing to work for your Populist Democracy.
I promise to protect our bill of rights and provide for our health, education and welfare.

K. F. Moseley "Belle Starr"

The Sponsors for Eric Moncur are:
Jule C. Anderson, 575-9th Ave., Education Consultant
Americ Azvedo, 269 Cherry St., Radio Producer
Phyllis A. Balderam, 271-9th Ave., Health Educator
Janice Bernard, 18 Presidio Terrace, Artist, Paralegal
Melba F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
Lawrence E. Danos, 835 Cole St., Machine Shop Specialist
Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
Shukri E. Duduma, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Locksley, Production Manager
Florence Fried, 271-9th Ave., Retired
Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Clery Court
H. Alfred Hanke, 993 Harrison St., Business Man
Alanna Hartson, 269 Cherry St., Education Director
David H. Hill, 3119 Clay St., Engineer
James A. Hirabayashi, 337 Market St., Professor
Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
Lorrie K. Inagaki, 3319 Clay Street, Attorney
Richard W. Lowry, 2235-47th Ave., Travel Agent
Salomon E. Martinez, 5809 Mission St., Businessman
Patricia Rose, 415 Randolph St., Designer
Charles J. Sahourieh, 66 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
Mark E. Schwier, 350 Turk St., Research Assistant
E. R. Scrofani, 4301-20th St., Teacher
Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
Hiram Smith, 345 Menticello, Director-Legal Services Program
Leon E. Smith, 1395 Golden Gate, Business Representative
Mario V. Vega, 59 Paulding, Gardener
Elmer Wilhelm, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
George K. Woo, 1729 Lake St., Educator

The Sponsors for K.F. (Belle Starr) Moseley are:
Edward A. Barry, 415 Winston Dr., Attorney-at-Law
Clayton L. Bigbie, 230 Eddy St., Retired Auditor
Pauline Burks, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
Philip Curatola, 1436 Waller St., Musician
Loretta L. Dunne, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
Lynd Circe Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
Paul "Ralf" Laguna, 2267-30th Ave., Artist
Andrew A. Livers, 373 Ellis St., Disabled
Ellen W. Mahoney, 415 Winston Dr., Librarian
Mark Mahone, 415 Winston Dr., Student
Ray Lee McCracken, 480 Eddy St., Painter
Linda Marie Pillay, 156 Carl St., Writer
Timothy Dwayne Rice, 480 Eddy St., Mechanic
Trina L. Smith, 2267-30th Ave., Painter
Marie Sooklaris, 412 Fair Oaks St., Tax Consultant
Joyce Stoller, 105 San Jose, Activist
Kendall R. Summers, 389 Dolores, Disabled
Carol Leigh Sprea, 3740-25th St.
David A. Whitaker, 1456 Page St.

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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WENDY NELDER

My address is 150 Casitas Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer/Member of Board of Supervisors
My age is 41

My qualifications for office are: As a supervisor, former assistant city attorney and current president of Queen's Bench (Bay Area women lawyers), I work to benefit all San Franciscans — while maintaining prudent financial administration.

My priorities include:
- Retaining jobs and attracting new employment,
- Making Muni responsive and affordable.
- Creating needed services for seniors.
- Protecting neighborhoods and providing affordable housing.
- Assuring healthful drinking water.
- Restricting careless storage or transportation of lethal chlorine gas within The City.

To make our homes and streets safe, I led a successful drive for a fingerprint computer to modernize the Police Department.

My votes have benefited both renters and property owners. Wendy Nelder

The Sponsors for Wendy Nelder are:
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Casitas, Retired Police Chief
George Christopher, 1170 Sacramento St., Former Mayor of S.F.
Alex L. Pitcher, 61 Pomona, President of San Francisco NAACP
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Barlett, University Professor
Joan-Marie Shelley, 855 Burnett, Teacher
Ed Turner, 460 Gellert Dr., Union Official
Marie B. Brooks, 100 Stonestreet Dr., Executive
John T. Fang, 170 Gellert Dr., Publisher
Nina Raymund, 706 Faxon Ave., Director, Filipino Cultural Council
Rev. James Leach, 744 Urbana Dr., Pastor
John J. Moylan, 2955-24th Ave., Union Business Representative
Joe Sharpe, 1547-46th Ave., Labor Official
Ernest Machell, 133 Gillette, Administrator
Mark Forrester, 55 Elise St., Director, Sr. Escort Service
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Ellis St., Retired Teacher
Louella C. Leon, 1221 Hyde, Neighborhood Coordinator — Sr. Escort
Leonard “Lefty” Gordon, 140 Margaret, Social Worker
Ernest Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Shirley Cotelan Burton, 2727-1st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business & Civic Women's Organization
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Former Treasurer — San Francisco
Rev. Eugene Lumpkin, Jr., 20 Cashmere St., Coordinator Snr. Escort Service
William T. Reed, 2151-18th Ave., Retired City Employee
Thomas C. Tong, 846 Clay St., Merchant
Joseph A. Gaggero, 80 Somerset, Retired
Joseph J. Allen, 2186-36th Ave., Public Relations
Christopher Martin, 347 Green St., Businessman
Ernest Lenn, 3933 Clement, Retired Newspaperman
Phil F. Kennison, 34 Belcher, Administrator-Senior Escort
Angelo Rolando, 5276 Harrison, Real Estate Broker

ROBERT SQUERI

My address is 31 Hernandez
My occupation is Independent Businessman
My age is 35

My qualifications for office are: I am a native San Franciscan. Married to Denise Dempster, one daughter, residing at 31 Hernandez. Graduated Saint Ignatius High School (1965), San Francisco City College and Cal State, Hayward (1971). I am an independent businessman who is now interested in giving my services to the city. I feel the most important issues are education, jobs, safety on the streets and housing. It's time for a change.

Robert Squeri

The Sponsors for Robert Squeri are:
Alfred D. Bucci, 240 Dolores St., R.E. Appraiser
Angelo J. Boschetti, 10 Chaves Ave., Self-employed
Paul V. Cummings, 166 San Felipe St., Attorney
Dorothy V. Del Negro, 343 Panorama Dr., Clerk
Margaret C. DeOnusa, 3704 Mission St., Real Estate Broker
George Dickenson, 731 Cayuga St., Retired
Monica Duffy, 2171-21st Ave., Clerk
Claire H. Farrell, 2563-39th Ave., Clerk
Kathleen A. Guibengay, 2177-17th Ave., Administrator
Donald J. Hadley, 212 Castenada St., Advertising
Frank E. Hart, 15 Grecia Ave., Muni Judge
Daniel V. Jaime, 1708 Filbert, Title Searcher
Lucille Jones, 4646 California, Clerk
R.E. Kennedy, 55 Montecito Ave., Chief Appraiser Assessor
Margaret Keohane, 2673-45th Ave., Clerk
Thomas J. LaLanne, 161 Edgewood Ave., Attorney
Ardis McCann, 1789 McAllister St.
Lucy Palmiano, 11 Dolores St., Auditor
Miriam L. Pearson, 1280 Laguna St., Retired
Nadyne Ricks, 138 Hyde St., Receptionist
Clare Roddy, 1827-43rd Ave., Clerk
Patricia J. Smith, 522 Judah St., EDP Operator
Thomas T. Snyder, 2 Roosevelt Way, Title Officer
Denise Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Housewife
Robert Squeri, 31 Hernandez St., Sales

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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OLGA TALAMANTE

My address is 1086 Capp Street
My occupation is Administrator, Mission YMCA
My age is 32

My qualifications for office are: Graduate, U.C. Santa Cruz; Community Organizer, United Farmworkers Union; National Coordinator, Human Rights Office, American Friends Service Committee; Parent Involvement Coordinator, Head Start; Administrator, Mission YMCA.

It is the duty of government to provide community services. Since Proposition 13 all we have been provided is higher Muni fares, fewer teachers and cuts in health care and other services. Two years ago voters passed Proposition M to tax the big corporations. The Supervisors refuse to implement it; they listen to Big Business, not the people. I will fight to implement M, to make our city a decent place to live.

Olga Talamante

WILLIAM TOCCO

My address is 947 Geary Street
My occupation is Tax Consultant
My age is 33

My qualifications for office are: Leadership: Commission on the Aging Advisory Council; Delinquency Prevention Commission, Education Task Force; Kiwanis Club, Senior Citizens Committee Chairman; Internal Revenue Service Manager; Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars and AMVETS.

Priorities: We have seen a change from individual responsibility, to a belief in government as Big Brother and responsible for our welfare. We must regain pride in ourselves, and we must regain confidence in individual initiative. We must bring back respect for family values, respect for the elderly, respect for basic education, and respect for a safe city.

William Tocco

The Sponsors for Olga Talamante are:
Jennifer Biehn, 1086 Capp St., Community College Instructor
Peter Costello, 18928 Market St.
Karen Hudburgh, 2725 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Franzia, Fundraising Consultant
Sam Jordan, 4004-3rd St., Caterer
Gayle M. Justice, 1108 Page St., Fiscal Planner
Susan D. Latham, 1432 Page St., Artist
Leonard M. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., Longshoreman
Marie C. Malliet, 386 Maynard St., V.P. of S.F. Labor Union
Tessa Martinez, 2905 Harrison St., Bilingual Teacher
Michael Mitchell, 3254 Frederick St., Artist Painter
Eileen M. Pucelli, 1232 Alabama St., Social Worker
Steve Clifford Rabia, 2 Italy, California State Auditor
Sylvia Ramirez, 190 Emmet Ct., Legal Worker
Alberto Saldaínamo, 1363 Alabama, Attorney
Robert W. Switz, 642 Brubel, Vicar
Diane Thomas-Glass, 128-30th Ave., Religious Worker
Ronald D. Thomas-Glass, 128-30th Ave., Educator
William Valentine, 126 Laguna St., Clerical Worker
Robert D. Williams, 1809 Shrader, Nuc. Dharm Proj. Dir., Archdiocese S.F.
Thomas Yrene, 233 Arkansas, Retired Railroad Worker

The Sponsors for William Tocco are:
Donald W. Allen, 947 Geary, U.S. Postal Carrier, Member NALC AFL-CIO
Gloria R. Austria, 1505 Gough, Computer Operator
Frank J. Bello, 2021 Fox Plaza, Retired Lawyer
Gordon Bunker, 2029-14th Ave., Engineer
Francis Burger, 1339-32nd Ave., Ret. Electrician, Past CMDR Am. Legion
George R. Coan, 59 Chabot, Lawyer
John J. Doyle, 2998-22nd Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Ethel W. Donlan, 1815-40th Ave., Housewife
Wallace B. Dunlap, 1815-40th Ave., Retired CPA
William Fisher, 3578 Pierce, Retired Businessman
Mark Forrester, 55 Elise, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hennan, 685 Hancock, Retired Railroad Inspector
Ernest D. Hopper, 1957 Anza, Retired S.F. Police Officer
Samuel B. Johns, 2333-38th Ave., Retired Executive Chef
Thelma Kavanaugh, 350 Elise, Retired Teacher
Leon A. Latno, 191 Los Palmos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4102
Albert Park Li, 148 Highland, Retired MUNI mechanic
Ernest M. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Past Pres. Chauffeur’s Union
Local 265
Laura L. Lotti, 979 Avalon, Homemaker
John M. McDuffie, 444 Hyde, Member Union Local 1100, Barber
Florence M. Neil, 145 Guerrero, Retired
Georgia Ocasio, 947 Geary, Housewife
Chester Romanowicz, 935 Geary, Retired Seaman
Victor Romero, 850 Rutland, Retired Merchant Marine
Jose Del Rosario, 947 Geary, Chemical Engineer
Dorothy M. Rosenbaum, 1600 Sutter, Retired Federal Employee
Sam Rosey, 349 Cherry St., Retired
Frank T. Sharpe, 28 Admiral, Ret. Steamfitter, Member Union
Local 38
John Viber, 555 Arguello, Retired Businessman
Julius Zamacona, 63 San Juan, Ret. Warehouseman, Teamsters
Local 860
BEN TOM

My address is 1717 Jones St.
My occupation is Member: San Francisco Board of Education
My age is 56
My qualifications for office are: Almost six years as a member of the San Francisco Board of Education, experience with problem solving and familiarity with our city and its people. My wife Ruby and I have raised four children in San Francisco, all of whom attended public schools. I am supported by a broad cross section of our city's communities, leaders and constituents.
I will work toward cooperation between interest groups, improved city services and a livable urban environment. San Francisco is valuable and unique: its continued health of paramount importance. I will serve our city and work to keep it healthy.

Benjamin Tom

The Sponsors for Ben Tom are:
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Samuel Duca, 16 Wawona St., City Assessor
Agar Jaicks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Lim P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agripino R. Cerbato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
May Vail, 641-3rd Ave., Attorney at Law
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President, Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Reverend Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
John W. Holtzclaw, 1508 Taylor St., Urban Planner
Libby Denebein, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, S.F. Board of Education
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heather Ave., Physician
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President I.L.U.U.
Ruth S. Kadosh, 145 Del Mar, Airport Commissioner
Andrew Katten, 108 Turquoise Way, Business Executive
David J. Sanchez, 433 Bartlett, University Professor
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Henry Der, 439-45th Ave., Executive Director
Steven J. Dol, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada Wada, 654-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Dr. Z. L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 25 Clay Park, Volunteer
Peter Mezei, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th Ave., Special Assistant to the Mayor

NANCY G. WALKER

My address is 228 Anderson Street
My occupation is Member, Board of Supervisors
My age is 42
My qualifications for office are: I have kept the promises I made during my campaign for Supervisor. I have represented the interests of working people. I will continue to work to: make San Francisco a safe, healthy, economically sound and affordable place for families, single people, young and old to live and work; make our parks and streets clean and safe; assure accessible, affordable health care and public transportation; create good working conditions for city employees so they are more effective and productive; develop neighborhood businesses; equitably distribute police and fire services; develop jobs for our unemployed and productive activities for our children and youth.

Nancy G. Walker

The Sponsors for Nancy Walker are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut St., Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
John L. Burton, 350 Texas St., Member of Congress
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman, California Legislature
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Elizabeth H. Anello, 176 Julian Ave., Social Worker
Bernard Averbuch, 59 Rivoli, Public Relations
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadr, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruschera, 537-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 Stanford, Commissioner
Joseph Fieras, Jr., 1360 Laguna St., Attorney-at-Law
Louis J. Giraudo, 345 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Carlton Benjamin Goodlett, 2060 O'Farrell, Physician & Publisher
Victor Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan, Author/Lecturer
William F. McCabe, 355 Green, Attorney
Robert McDonnell, 220 Guerrero, Union Business Agent
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Kay Pachter, 155 Veddepug, Consumer Advocate
Gina Pannestri, 1324 Clayton St., Admin. Aide — Congressman
John Burton
Gertrude Bland Platt, 339 Walnut, Historic Preservation Consultant
Lucero C. Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Professional Civil Engineer
Thelma Shirley, 70 Eveson St., Facility Management
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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DORIS M. WARD
My address is 440 Davis Court, Apt. 1409
My occupation is Supervisor
My qualifications for office are: A deep concern for our City, all its neighborhoods, all its people and its development. I have worked for improved City services in Fire and Police protection, housing, health, transportation and senior services. Through the Council for Economic Development, I have worked for increased employment, especially entry level positions for the young or unemployed. I have twice been elected to the Board of Supervisors, following two terms with the Community College Board. I am the only supervisor with evening office hours open to all constituents without appointment.

The Sponsors for Doris M. Ward are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Boulevard, U.S. Congressman
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan, Assemblyman
Harry G. Brit, 362-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Member Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Member Board of Supervisors
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 Eucal Ave., Consultant
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor, Airport Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates, Attorney
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Pastor
Gwenn Craig, 493 Haight St., Pres. Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Jesse T. Esteva, 528 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Betty Lim Guimaraes, 780-82nd Ave., Program Manager Mayor's Office
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
James C. Hormel, 19 Miguel, Consultant
Aagar Juven, 62 Woodland, Chairman Party County Committee
Calvin Jones, 39 Esquina Dr., Pastor
Gordon J. Lau, 540-19th Ave., Attorney
Del Martin, 651 Duncan St., Author/Lecturer
Thomata N. Scott, 1912/16 Broderick St., Intake & Referral Specialist
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Yori Wada, 265-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Stephen H. Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

DAVE WHARTON
My address is 2040 Franklin St
My occupation is Public Service Attorney
My age is 42
San Francisco needs a new voice.
I believe in more City service per tax dollar, less regulation and red tape. The Board needs greater neighborhood and ethnic participation and fewer meaningless resolutions. Recognizing in-law units creates more affordable housing. I want more police fighting crime and special attention to senior citizens and social services.
Replace entrenched interests at City Hall. As Supervisor, I'll hold neighborhood forums to give everyone a voice.

The Sponsors for Dave Wharton are:
John S. Abney, 828 Chercy St., Sheriff's Sergeant
Gloria Armijo, 737 Pine St., Travel Executive
Robert F. Boyle Jr., 990 Prage St., Tutoring Center Dev. Director
Raymond Cohn, 1980 Scott St., Firefighter
James R. Diaz, 139-20th Ave., Architect
Mary Lou Finegold, 45 San Jacinto, Housewife
Merlmer Fleischacker III, 13 Bridgebay Plaza, Business Executive
Charles Q. Forester, 1266 Fulton St., City Planner
Roger Friedenthal, M.D., 2530 Chestnut St., Physician
Susan Gareil, 1874 Green St., Law Student
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerrero St., Newspaper Editor
Alan Lubliner, 1919 Grant Ave., Transportation Planner
Patrick W. McGrew, 2398 Pacific Ave., Architect
Lee Menconi, 532 Clayton St., Financial Manager
Richard B. Morton, 278-33rd Ave., Business Assoc. Executive
Peter J. Nordoza, 4089-26th St., Administrative Assist., City of S.F.
Ramsey B. Navarrete, 253 Castro St., Computer Software Manufacturer
Ronald Neipor, 2040 Franklin St., Financial Marketing Specialist
Patrick J. O'Herrn, 3559 Jackson St., Attorney
Ronald S. Peterson, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfrew, 21-5th Ave., Attorney
Michael Earnest Sanchez, 579 Corbett Ave., Entertainment Management
Michael A. Schoch, 1266 Fulton St., Landscape
Ross R. Snow, 3422-16th St., Teacher
Lawrence J. Stipnus, 308 Maple, Business Executive
Carla White, 2500 Van Ness, Account Executive

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROSARIO ANAYA

My address is 240 Dolores Street #331
My occupation is President, S.F. Board of Education
My qualifications for office are: I have six years of experience on the Board, the last year as President, and four years on the State Educational Innovation and Planning Commission. I am Executive Director of the Mission Language and Vocational School with responsibility for negotiation, administration and evaluation of youth and adult training programs. We need to continue setting higher academic goals, recognizing the diversity of our students, and establishing exciting educational alternatives. All children deserve a safe, stimulating environment to prepare for higher education and employment. The district has gained a momentum we must work hard to maintain.

Rosario Anaya

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-200th St., President Community College Board
John Bardis, 1501 Lincoln Way, Management Consultant
Harry G. Britz, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Willie L. Brown, Jr. 2200 Pacific Ave., Lawyer/Legislator
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Agripino R. Cerbutos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellamonicia, 3323 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers Assoc.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzalez, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Goody, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-18th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Sybel Klein, 19 San Jacinto Way, Business Teacher
Leroy King, 75 Sampa Lane, Regional Director, I.L.W.U.
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner Board of Education
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman CA Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3352 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Castas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 196 Bocana, Public Relations
Dr. David J. Sanchez, Jr., 433 Bartlett, President Police Commission
Stanley R. Stefanic, 759-23rd Ave., Unitarian Universalist Minister
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones, Member Board of Education
Michael A. Toms, 269 States, Executive Dir.
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive

MARGARET CRICHTON DeOSUNA

My address is 3774 B Mission Street
My occupation is Real Estate Broker
My age is 52
My qualifications for office are: I am a former member of the Criminal Justice Committee of the Association of Bay Area Government's Regional Citizens Forum, former State Assembly Nominee, Real Estate Broker, owner of DeOsuna Realty, married for twenty-six years and the mother of five children. I received my B.A. Degree (Economics and Spanish) from Macalester College. I am an alumnus of the University of California, San Francisco State, City College (Computer Information Science) and have studied piano for twenty years. I support teaching students the ability to change their future, basic computer technology, cutting violence and drugs in schools and administrative waste.

Margaret Crichton DeOsuna

The Sponsors for Margaret Crichton DeOsuna are:
John J. Barbagelata, 15 San Lorenzo Way, Business-Real Estate Broker
Eugene S. Hopp, 33 Heath Ave., Physician
Frank J. DeOsuna, 37748 Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3900-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 85 Park St., Retired
Virginia Crighton, 350 Arballo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Nour Taqi-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hantryt, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkorth, 77 Gladstone Drive, Outdoor Advertising
Patrick C. Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., County Central Committeeman
Suzanne Fitzgerald, 128 Detroit St., Housewife
James E. Curtin, 59 Newton St., Real Estate Broker
Donald Donaldson, 460 Hazelwood, County Central Committeeman
Patricia K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 630 Edinburgh St., Veterans Benefits Counselor
Joseph J. Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Warehouseman
Cecilia Cottonaro, 93 Theresa St., Housewife
Lorenzo Flores, 3151 Aleman Blvd., Senior Citizen
Terence Faulkner, 237-42nd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Michael J. DeOsuna, 37748 Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramón P. Nava, 2107 Aleman Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. Mcginty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 37748 Mission St., Student
Evelyn Peint, 50 Park St., Operations Officer
Donald Michael Carr, 316-29th Ave., Retired
Mark B. Osuna, 37748 Mission St., Student
Blair A. William Osuna, 37748 Mission St., Student
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WILLIAM FELZER
My address is 2925 Rivera Street
My occupation is Engineering Educator
My qualifications for office are: 16 years teaching experience, City College of San Francisco; 25 years Industrial experience as a Mechanical, Industrial Engineer; Registered Professional Engineer; General Secondary Credential; President, American Association Retired Persons, Sunset Chapter.

PROPOSE:
New 4 year Professional Sport Curriculums, 3 year High School Diploma Programs, 2 year Certificate of Achievement Programs, Semiprofessional Programs.
Reducing the number of High Schools; operating them like colleges from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M.; using collegiate Time Class Schedules for students' and teachers' programs; thereby increasing classroom usage, eliminating duplications, and saving millions of dollars.
Modifying Report Cards to show Grade Level Achievements for Reading, Writing, Mathematics.

William Felzer

MYRA KOPF
My address is 1940 - 12th Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent
My qualifications for office are: Years of experience and first-hand knowledge of the School District, as a parent, educator, PTA activist and School Board Member.
Commitment to provide stability, to secure necessary funding, and to continued responsiveness to the needs and concerns of students, teachers and parents.
Although during my four years in office our schools have improved significantly, test scores have risen, and public confidence in our public schools has increased, there is still much to do.
I pledge continued vigil, determination and energy to ensure that all students in San Francisco have the best possible education.

Myra Kopf

The Sponsors for William Felzer are:
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Supervisor
E. Patricia Lucey, 69 Huntington Drive, Attorney
A. John Shimmon, 19 Middlefield Dr., Deputy to Board of Equalization
John J. Brady, 1441-38th Ave., Administrative Dean, CCSF
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinek, 1080 Alabama St., Engineering Educator
Betsy J. Johnson, 4301 Ocean Ave., Business Educator, CCSF
Charles P. Paccagnella, 345 Hanover St., Civil Engineer
Lawrence Jue, 1065 Baker St., Consulting Engineer
Whitney A. Gehrke, 3209 Noriega St., Statistician
Evelyn N. Kernhof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2610-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Baroco, 57 Paradise St., Administrative Assistant
John P. Comisky, 1230-26th Ave., Retired Stationary Engineer
Clement Ding, 161 Madison St., Maintenance Supervisor
Curt P. Fischer, 2191-33rd Ave., Purchasing Agent
James T. Fitzgerald, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pullis, 2201-39th Ave., R.E. Appraiser
Christina Solari, 1518-38th Ave., Communications
Anna Mae Stacke, 251 Vicente, Accountant
S. J. Swanson, 318 Vienna St., Sr. Accountant
Richard J. Tessman, 1834-36th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidly, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Ziskos, 2531-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espeland, 1578-27th Ave., Sta. Engineer
Lillian H. Sherman, 601 O'Farrell St., Retired Nurse

The Sponsors for Myra Kopf are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agripino Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlota Texidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Educator
Libby Denebene, 200 St. Francis Blvd., S.F. Board of Education Member
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola, Member Board of Supervisors/Educator
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor of the City and County of S.F.
Zuretti L. Gooby, 295 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Barbara Holman, 182 Eastwood, School/Community Leader
Thomas Hsieh, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Ruth Asawa Lanier, 1116 Castro, Artist
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona St., Bank Officer
Leo T. McCarthy, 400 Magellan Ave., Assemblyman, California Legislature
Peter Mezey, 3382 Clay St., Lawyer
John L. Molinaro, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 827-24th Ave., Executive Director, Japanese Community Youth Council
Howard N. Nemirovski, 40 Sea View Terrace, Attorney
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson, Attorney-at-Law and Member, Board of Supervisors
Michael Schneider, 4209-22nd St., Deputy Chief CAL/OSHA
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton St., Labor Union Official
Burl Toler, 581 Orizaba, Police Commissioner
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., Agency Executive
Nancy G. Walker, 220 Anderson St., Member Board of Supervisors
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ctr., Educator/Member Board of Supervisors

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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GEORGE LANDIS O'BRIEN

My address is 1506 - 8th Avenue
My occupation is Deschooler/Economics Instructor
My qualifications for office are: I am an opponent of government control and an advocate of individual liberty.
If elected I will work to:
— Promote alternatives to government education
— Support home education.
— Oppose compulsory attendance laws.
— Return control of education to parents and students.
— End taxes for schools people don’t want.
— Dispose of empty schools.
— Get rid of the huge statist bureaucracy.
— Let parents and students decide what courses are taught, how students dress, if prayers recited.
— Let parents and students decide where to go to school.
People will control education when government doesn’t!
Vote for George O’Brien for Board of Education.

George L. O’Brien

SODONIA M. WILSON, Ph.D.

My address is 540 Darien Way
My occupation is incumbent
My age is 48
My qualifications for office are: I have resided in San Francisco for 31½ years and my son attended grades kindergarten through twelfth in San Francisco’s Public Schools. Consequently, I know that our youngsters must be proficient in basic skills and should explore the areas of high technology for future employment. Parental involvement in education is also essential for more effective student learning and school-community relations. I have been an instructor, counselor, coordinator and am presently a college administrator. The programs I supervise are extended Opportunity Programs and Services, College Readiness, Tutoring, Disabled Students and Women’s Re-entry. I possess a B.A.-Nursing, M.A.-Counseling, Ph.D—Clinical Psychology.

Sondia M. Wilson

The Sponsors for George L. O’Brien are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert, Civil Liberties Attorney
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Kroutil, 525 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Beverly Locke, 117 Pierce, Controller
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Hannan M. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Data Processing Consultant
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist
Stanley F. Kern, 2513 Sacramento, Insurance Auditor
Raymond Borkowski, 1300 Lawton St., Railroad Clerk
Milton Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proponent
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1335-39th Ave., Commit Mail Receiving Agent
Judith Goeltz, 130 Clifford Ter., Publisher
Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., Ballet Access Consultant
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student and Photographer
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student

The Sponsors for Sondia Wilson are:
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon, Mayor of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 8 Sloot Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 2200 Pacific, Lawyer/Legislator
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon, Supervisor
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Supervisor
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Deuts M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President Community College Board
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Workers’ Compensation
Benjamin Tom, 1717 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Amos C. Brown, 111 Lunado Way, Minister
Josephine E. Cole, 1596-36th Ave., Educator
Arthur H. Coleman, 11 Hinkley Walk, Physician
H. Welton Flynn, 76 Venus, Public Accountant
Howard S. Gloyd, 555 Noriega, Pastor
Jim Gonzalez, 274-11th St., Special Assistant to the Mayor
Zuretti Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Leonard M. Grimes, Jr., 876 Giarrero St., State Gov’t. Employee
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Union Official, I.L.W.U.
Philis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2255 Washington, Retired
Sandy A. Ouye, 822-24th Ave., Administrator
Alex L. Pitcher, Jr., 61 Pomona, Pres. N.A.A.C.P.
Pauline Rosenbaum, 137-3rd Ave., Housewife
Stephen Walters, 188 Eureka St., Fund Raiser
Elouise Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT R. BACCI
My address is 2478 - 23rd Avenue
My occupation is Lawyer
My age is 33
My qualifications for office are: A graduate of the University of San Francisco, I have an active law practice, I serve as Secretary of the Geary Blvd. Merchants Association, and am a Council of District Merchants delegate to two City environmental project advisory committees.

As a third generation San Franciscan, I am concerned about the quality of education in San Francisco and feel I can make a substantial contribution to improve the standards and direction of the Community College System. I will focus on a return to the kind of basic education that will properly qualify its students for jobs that are available in today’s San Francisco job market.

Robert R. Bacci

MIKE S. BERNICK
My address is 378 Golden Gate
My occupation is Professor/Agency Director
My qualifications for office are:

1. Strong background in education: Adjunct Faculty Member at University of San Francisco and Golden Gate University; Training at Harvard (B.A.), Oxford (B.Phil.), U.C. Berkeley (J.D.).

2. Director of San Francisco Renaissance Employment & Economic Development: An economic development agency that establishes job training programs and small businesses, and aids San Franciscans into steady jobs.

3. Ideas for Better Education: Strengthen the literacy and vocational training that can lead to steady jobs; strengthen the solid, traditional academic courses that can lead to higher educational opportunities.

With experience and ideas, I'll help the Community Colleges work better for San Francisco.

Michael S. Bernick

The Sponsors for Robert R. Bacci are:
Adolphus Andrews III, 2611 Divisadero, Real Estate Investments
James J. Bourgart, 1 Aztec, Legislative Aide
Agnes I. Chan, 10 Miller Place, Consultant
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Bruce Dingwall, 35 Buckingham Way, Manager
Edward Galletti, 187 Avila St., Service Club President
Ruth Church Gupta, 1910 Green St., Attorney
Mike Henderson, 3500 Cabrillo St., Small Business Owner
Gregory P. Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Williar, Area Housing Manager
Robert G. Johns, 4347-20th Ave., Association Manager
Edward H. Lawson, 469-14th Ave., Urban Planner
Mildred W. Levin, 251 San Anselmo Ave., Attorney
John Lo Schiavo, S.J., Xavier Hall, U.S.F. University President
Charles Meyers, 1789 Eucalyptus Dr., Public Relations Consultant
Bertha S. Nelson, 527-26th Ave., Public Relations Director, Wine Co.
M. Lester O'Shea, 2863 Pacific, Managing Partner Investment Company
Mary F. Putilton, 6423 Geary Blvd., Merchant Association President
Leslie Payne, 343 Tara St., Parole Agent
Michael S. Salerno, 95 Crestlake Dr., Neighborhood Business Owner
John A. Schmidt, 1182 Fulton St., Chairman, Financial Institution
John Patrick Short, 1000 Green St., Parking Authority Chairman
John W. Stark, 2595 Washington St., Transportation Analyst
John E. Sullivan, 104 Glenbrook Ave., Lawyer
William F. Terheyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Yuskich, 177 San Aloso Way, Fundraiser
Marguerite A. Warren, 1746-32nd Ave., Semi-retired
Frederick J. Whitsun, 3601 Clement St., Superior Court Officer
Shirley C. Yawitz, 245 Yerba Buena, Lawyer

The Sponsors for Mike Bernick are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Ella Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 870 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agrinino R. Cerebato, 60 Collins Street, Electrical Engineer
Christina Chen, 2233-44th Ave., Housewife/Teacher
W. Jack Choy, 373 Marina Blvd., Attorney
Andrew Colvin, 1959-30th Ave., Attorney
Joseph Driscoll, 330 Taraval, Firefighter
Timothy Dupre, 5255 Diamond Heights, Dir. Booker T. Washington Center
Zuretti Goosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Hales, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lirardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heather Avenue, Physician
LeRoy King, 79 Zampa Lane, Regional Dir. LCW
Quentin Köpp, 68 Country Club, President, Board of Supervisors
Louis Hop Lee, 788-18th Avenue, Attorney/Civil Service Comm. Council
Leland J. Lazuars, 2277 Clay Street, Judge, Superior Ct., Retired
William J. Lowenberg, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezez, 3382 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Peitz, 1150 Kearnan, Planner
Isadore Pivenick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymundo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Eduardo Sandowal, 756-7th Street, Attorney
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Randy Stallings, 397-30th St., Human Rights Coordinator
Kevin Sturr, 443 Chestnut, Journalist/Editor
Byron F. Wong, 1554-36th Ave., Attorney

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ROBERT E. BURTON

My address is 2727 - 41st Avenue
My occupation is Incumbent member of Community College Board/Commissioner Workers' Compensation Appeals Board.
My qualifications for office are: As a member of the Community College District for ten years, I am proud of my record and my efforts to increase student and community involvement. The Community College has expanded facilities and extended services to the entire community, establishing a Chinatown and downtown centers. Twenty years in adult teaching has confirmed my views and beliefs of the need and value of adult education. All, regardless of age, sex, religion, racial or ethnic background have had an opportunity to continue their education — in this rapidly-changing and increasingly complex technical society this must continue in these days of economic and fiscal uncertainty.

Robert E. Burton

The Sponsors for Robert E. Burton are:

Booker T. Anderson, 1175 Ellis, Governing Board Member, SACC
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th Street, College Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadrack Street, Planning Commissioner
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City and County of San Francisco
Phillip Burton, 5 Sloat Blvd., Member of Congress
Shirley C. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., President, Golden Gate Business and Civic Women's Organization
Lulu M. Carter, 2037 Fulton Street, Teacher/Chair Black Caucus
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon Street, Banker
Margaret Cruz, 259 Monterey Blvd., Former Pres. Mexican American Political Assoc.
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz, Police Commissioner
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegan, 555 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community Colleges
JoAnn Hendricks, 250-31st Ave., College Business Teacher
James Herman, 635 Connecticut Street, President IFLWU
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongisto, 65 Wood Street, Supervisor, San Francisco County
Carole Jacob, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. County Bank Chair
Theodore G. Kaplanis, 600-18th Ave., English Editor
Willie B. Kennedy, 1360 Lyon Street, Supervisor
Jean E. Kurnt, 80 Mercado Ave., Environmentalist
Robert McDonnell, 229 Guerrero Street, Union Business Agent
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut Street, Member, Board of Supervisors
Sandra A. Oury, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 1426 Willard, Lawyer
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 349 Montecillo, Director-Legal Services Program
Stanley Smith, 411 Folsom Street, Union Official
Doris M. Ward, 440 Davis Ct., Supervisor

ROBERT A. Da PRATO

My address is 374 Laidley
My occupation is Physician
My age is 37
My qualifications for office are: I am an advocate of individual liberty and a completely voluntary society. If elected, I will:
— work for a Community College system funded entirely by user fees and individual or business donations.
— enthusiastically seek out teachers who attract such voluntary financial support by the excellence and relevance of their instruction.
— oppose all coercive (tax) funding of Community College programs. There is no fair way to spend money extorted through taxation. Each working person — not government — knows best how to spend his/her own hard-earned income.

Vote for Doctor Robert Da Prato for the Community College Board.

Robert A. Da Prato

The Sponsors for Robert A. DaPrato are:
Bartholomew Lee, 327 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Peron, 3745-17th St., Marijuana Activist
George Landis O'Brien, 1501-8th Ave., Economist
Bonnie Hoy, 930 Hayes, Abortion Rights Activist
Eric Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark R. Pickens, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-Drug/Anti-Tax Activist
Dena M. Cornett, 1951 Hayes St., Administrative Systems Coordinator
Kathleen O'Shea, 3346-21st St., Registered Nurse
Judith Goelitz, 130 Clifford St., Publisher
William Tomasek, 1330 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Anna B. Couchman, 24 Carmel St., Registered Nurse
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 107 Sanchez, Data Processing Consultant
Francis S. Goelitz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Edward Lee Holder, 374 Laidley St., Systems/Analyst
Ira W. Carter, 1335-36th Ave., Comm. Mail Receiving Agent
Martin Meder, 214-6th St., Messenger/Student
Albert Winslow, 1200 Treat St., Salesman
Marshall E. Schwartz, 617 Baker St., Telecommunications Systems Consultant
Richard Winger, 2201 Baker, Ballot Access Consultant
Penny L. Voorhees, 825 Jones St., Student
Dominic Isaac, 1515 Sutter, Student/Photographer
Sean Galin, 1608 Sacramento, Rock Star
Joyce Peters, 1446-48th Ave., Anti-War Activist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
CAROLE MIGDEN
My address is 561 - 28th Street
My occupation is Fiscal Planner/Administrator
My age is 34
My qualifications for office are: As executive director of Operation Concern, a mental health clinic located at Pacific Medical Center, I work daily with budgets and proposal writing for funding.

The Community College system in San Francisco faces grave financial cutbacks in the coming years. My experience in fundraising and budget analysis is critically needed on that board.

When elected I pledge:
— to secure full-time lobby presence in Sacramento to ensure adequate state funding
— to develop additional revenue sources from the public and private sectors
— to maintain the wide range of college programs presently available which meet the needs of our diverse student population.

The Sponsors for Carole Migden are:
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County
Sally Brunne, 110 Hoffman Ave., Library Advocate
Gonzalo Caravelli, 158 Granville Way, Parent
Agripino R. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Gwen Craig, 493 Haight St., President Harvey Milk Gay Political Club
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Board of Education
Sam Duca, 116 Wawona St., Assessor
Ann Elissier, 3074 Pacific Ave., Consultant
Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores Street, Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Marcia L. Hunt, 146-15th Ave., Public Affairs/Information
S.F.U.S.D.
Agar Jaicks, 62 woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Stein Jehl, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margot Kaufman, 306-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lannon, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milton F. Reiterman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomarita N. Scott, 191½ Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Division Street, Facilities Management
Arlo Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Attorney
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Stephen H. Watters, 188 Eureka St., Fundraiser
Evelyn L. Wilson, 2159-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

DR. LELAND MOGLEN,
M.S.; J.D.
My address is 1216 Taylor, #24
My occupation is Public Health Administrator
My age is 38
My qualifications for office are: I have been a civil servant for the City and County of San Francisco for over nine continuous years. My life and career is dedicated to public service. I have two graduate degrees from highly accredited local institutions, One is a Master of Science in Business Administration, 1981, from San Francisco State University. The other is a Doctor of Jurisprudence from San Francisco Law School, 1982. I have founded a labor union which is registered with the City & County of San Francisco to prevent the intrusion of political interests into the objective Civil Service System.

Leland Moglen

The Sponsors for Leland Moglen are:
George Quan, 1842 Mason, Sr. Management Assistant
Michael Williams, 1212-10th Ave., Personnel Officer
Jonathan Tao, 1216 Taylor St., Architect
John M. Deresenzo, 3024 Laguna, Group Insurance Manager
Gregory L. Johnson, 1716 Fillmore St., Supervisor
Marvin Hall, 1570 Palou Ave., Data Anal. Coordinator
Alice Willis, 169 Senno Dr., Administrative Assistant
JoAnne Jennings, 748 Cayuga Ave., Administrative Assistant
Patricia Zecher Machalhian, 1338-29th Ave., Medical Assist.
Alfred Kielwasser, 163 Park St., Medical Examiner Assist.
David P. Lewis, 300 Buchanan, Civil Servant
Truman Dennis Bryan, 18-A Norfolk, Eligibility Worker
Helen G. Kairy, 766-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merjig, 314 Kearny, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Corder, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilyn Sperber, 205B Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevaris, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gannon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Deresenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 680 Lombard, Pharmacist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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JOHN RIORDAN

My address is 1426 Willard Street
My occupation is Incumbent
My age is 46
My qualifications for office are: Lawyer and father of two sons, Liam and Sean. I was elected to Board since 1972 and served as President, Vice-President and thrice Chairperson of the Finance Committee. The District has over 68,000 students. It has a first rate faculty. The educational cost per student is the lowest in the State. I was Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jack Shelley and part time instructor at University of San Francisco Law School. I serve on these Boards: Council of Civic Unity, A.D.A. and the Irish Literary and Historical Society. I served as Commissioner, San Francisco Social Services Department.

John Riordan

SAL ROSSELLI

My address is 349 Lexington Street
My occupation is Business Manager
My qualifications for office are: Ex-officio College Board Member representing 70,000 San Franciscans attending classes, office holder in statewide Community College associations, City College Valedictorian, Curriculum Committee Chair, former Student Body President.

I'm committed to finding solutions for our District's crises in education, funding and morale.

We must make educational excellence — not politics — our top priority by improving basic academic programs and providing training for existing jobs.

We must lobby the State Legislature more effectively, pursue federal dollars more aggressively and develop new fundraising appeals to foundations and corporations.

We must have open meetings and fair hiring policies to restore educational integrity and revive faculty morale.

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli are:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona Ave., Supervisor, Attorney, Mother
Nancy Walker, 228 Anderson, Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebeim, 200 St. Francis Blvd., Member, Board of Education
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Tom Ammiano, 162 Prospect Ave., Teacher
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Investor
Angelo J. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Deaerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Legislative Director L.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
June McKeskie Murphy, 2255 Washington, Police Commissioner
Connie O'Connor, 30 Chicago Way, Deputy Sheriff (Lieutenant)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
Fr. Miles O'B. Riley, 3321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Stanley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukovich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yoritada Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. “Jack” Webb, 100 Mowdala Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hilirius, Minister

The Sponsors for John Riordan are:
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Burton, 2727-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
Edward F. Callanan Jr., 162 Ilopa Ave., Library Commissioner
Mary I. Callanan, 1661 Dolores St., Treasurer, San Francisco
Preston Cook, 3301 Clay St., Partner Tri Realtors
Robert DeVries, 351-B 29th St., Lawyer
Lee S. Dolson, 172 Portola Dr., City College Teacher
Herman Gallegos, 149 Ripley, Corporate Director
Vincent Hallinan, 1080 Chestnut St., Lawyer
James H. Herman, 635 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kaldish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fotheodoris Kilis, 2001 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2553 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 554 Brussels, Dir. Contract Compliance - S.F. P.U.C.

Clinton Reilly, 1740 Bush Street, Political Consultant
Geneviere Riordan, 1426 Willard, Housewife
Mary Margarette Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, English Teacher
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson St., Facility Management
Florence F. Sinton, 4 Russian Hill Place, Retired Instructor
Julie Tang, 780-18th Ave., College Board Member
Michael C. Tidriner, 872 Jersey St., Attorney
Yori Wada, 565-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Moceda, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy R. Wolford, 91 Sanchez, College Board Member
Alan S. Wong, 1280 Ellis St., Human Service Worker
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

Statements are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
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ALAN S. WONG

My address is 1280 Ellis Street, #12
My occupation is Executive Director, YMCA
My qualifications for office are: I was born in San Francisco and graduated from its public schools, City College, and State University with a Master's Degree in social work. Since 1959, I've served the City through the Council of Churches, United Way, SPUR, Human Rights Commission, and other organizations. I have top-level management experience with Self-Help for the Elderly, Asian Inc., and am presently a YMCA Executive Director.

Mayor Feinstein appointed me to fill the vacancy on the College Board when Judge Lillian Sing left. I intend to use my experience to ensure that the college provides the best possible education for students.

Alan S. Wong

The Sponsors for Alan S. Wong are:
Lucille S. Abrahamson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Rosario Anaya, 240 Dolores St., President, S.F. Board of Education
Ernest C. Ayala, 4402-20th St., Community Board Member, President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commission
Phillip Burton, 8 Skoat Blvd., Member U.S. Congress
Agripino R. Cebato, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
John Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Carlos Testidor Del Portillo, 84 Berkeley Way, Pres., Civil Serv. Comm.
Zuretti L. Goodby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongstu, 65 Wood, Board of Supervisors, Member of
Eugene S. Hopf, M.D., 33 Heather Ave., Physician
Willie B. Kennedy, 1300 Lyon St., Supervisor
Bill Maher, 2260-9th Ave., Commissioner, Board of Education
Fred J. Martin, Jr., 201 Wawona, Bank Officer
John L. Molinaro, 1322 Chestnut St., Supervisor
Dick Pabich, 79 Urnans Terrace, Advertising Consultant
George R. Reilly, 2774-34th Ave., State Board of Equalization, Retired

John Riorian, 1426 Willard St., Lawyer
A. John Shinnmon, 19 Middelfield Dr., Deputy to Board Member
Carol Ruth Silver, 68 Ramona, Supervisor
Richard Sklar, 1 Presidio Terrace, Public Official
Julie Tang, 788-81th Ave., College Board Member
Ben Tom, 1717 Jones St., Member, Board of Education
Yori Wada, 365-4th Ave., Social Worker
Nancy G. Walker, 228 Anderson St., Supervisor
A. Cécil Williams, 60 Hillitas St., Minister, Glide Church
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., College Board Member
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis St., Economist

QUICK! What's a good way to have some fun, help your neighbors, and make some extra money?

ANSWER:

RAPID! ¿Cuál es una buena manera de divertirse, ayudar a sus vecinos y ganar dinero?

RESPUESTA

Statement are volunteered by the candidates and have not been checked for accuracy.
PROPOSITION A
Shall an Office of Citizens Complaints be established in the Police Department with authority to investigate complaints made by citizens of police misconduct and recommend action to the Chief of Police?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Police Department has an Internal Affairs Division within the Department. This Division, staffed by police officers, investigates citizen complaints against police officers and makes recommendations for action to the Chief of Police. There is a civilian investigator who also investigates complaints and reports to the Police Commission.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition A would create an Office of Citizen Complaints in the Police Department. The Director, appointed by the Police Commission, and the investigators and hearing officers shall never have been members of the Police Department. The Office shall investigate citizen complaints of police misconduct and shall recommend action to the Chief of Police. This proposition does not eliminate the Internal Affairs Division. It does not prohibit the Department from investigating and taking action now permitted by the Charter. The Office shall make monthly summaries of complaints and quarterly reports concerning possible changes and amendments in Department policies and practices.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to create an Office of Citizen’s Complaints within the Police Department.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want complaints by citizens to continue to be handled by the Internal Affairs Division and the civilian investigator.

Controller’s Statement on “A”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition A:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, the increase in the cost of government would be determined by the Office of Citizen Complaints’ approved annual budget. For fiscal year 1982-83 the cost increase could not exceed $625,000 adjusted thereafter for inflation.

How Supervisors Voted on “A”

On May 24 the Board of Supervisors voted 8-3 on the question of placing Proposition A on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Lee Dolson, Quentin Kopp and Wendy Nelder.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP A BEGINS ON PAGE 86
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will give us more police protection, increase the cost-effectiveness of the Police Department, and improve relations between citizens and the police.

In 1981, San Franciscans spent more than $850,000 to have 16 police officers behind desks investigating citizens' complaints in the Police Department. Prop. A requires the Police Commission to hire trained civilian investigators to do this work, putting those 16 police officers on the street where they are needed to prevent crime.

Civilian investigators' salaries will cost the city less than those of police officers, whose benefits cost four times those of other city employees. Prop. A will limit the budget for investigating citizens' complaints to 60% of what was spent in 1981 — reducing the cost of these investigations by over $350,000. That is money which will be spent for salaries of police officers who are back on the street. And the city will still have competent, fair investigations of complaints against the Police Department.

Being a cop is tough work — and the vast majority of our police officers do a good job. But San Franciscans are entitled to get a thorough, fair investigation of complaints against the Police Department when they have problems. It is difficult for police officers to investigate and recommend discipline against fellow police officers. Having trained civilians investigate complaints will be more impartial, and fairer for police officers and citizens.

Proposition A will NOT create a Civilian Review Board or a new bureaucracy. The Police Chief and Police Commission will still make decisions about discipline and police policy. Proposition A means they can do that with unbiased information.

Proposition A is a fair, responsible and cost-effective plan that San Franciscans have supported for many years.

A YES vote on Proposition A is a vote for professional law enforcement.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

A YES vote on Proposition A will:

— Put more police officers on the street fighting crime.

— Provide fair, efficient, professional investigators of citizens complaints.

— Save taxpayers in investigative costs.

— Help reward professional conduct in our police force and improve its respect in the community.

Join us in voting YES on Proposition A.

Art Agnos
Assemblyman
Jeff Brown
Public Defender
Jo Daly
Police Commissioner
Michael Hennessey
Sheriff
Louis Hop Lee
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Proposition A would, after 1985 when a court ordered consent decree expires, allows a savings in salary costs that could be well over $400,000 when high priced police officers are replaced with less expensive civilian investigators.

Furthermore, Proposition A will provide professional and unbiased investigations of complaints against police officers. Currently, police officers accused of misconduct are investigated by fellow officers. That's just not fair for the officer or for the person making the complaint.

Lastly, when only police officers can be used to investigate other police officers, an atmosphere of mistrust is engendered, as some think that they cannot be impartial because of the personal and professional friendships that develop between the investigator and the accused.

Proposition A makes fiscal sense and is just good government. Vote YES on Proposition A.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A to ensure fair and impartial handling of citizen complaints against the police department.

Complaints of police misconduct are now investigated by police officers assigned to the Internal Affairs Bureau (I.A.B.). Proposition A would mandate the creation of an Office of Citizen Complaints (O.C.C.) staffed by professional civilian investigators, hired through civil service. Proposition A also affords persons filing complaints — and the accused officer — a hearing before a civilian hearing officer.

Proposition A will promote efficient, cost-effective investigation of citizen complaints: the O.C.C.'s budget is limited to 60% of the I.A.B.'s budget. The supervisory-rank police officers now staffing the I.A.B. can be reassigned to law enforcement work.

Most important, Proposition A will give the public and the police greater confidence that the complaint-resolution process is impartial. It is difficult for police officers to investigate complaints against co-workers. And complainants often feel intimidated or frustrated when one police officer investigates a complaint against another.

Police officers also will benefit, because O.C.C. investigations, unlike those of the I.A.B., will not be subject to questions regarding favoritism, impartiality and fairness.

Proposition A does not create a civilian review board. The Police Commission, composed of five citizens appointed by the Mayor, will continue to manage the Police Department and serve as a disciplinary review board. Proposition A would not shift the department's disciplinary powers, which remain with the Police Chief and Commission. But Proposition A will better equip the Commission to carry out its responsibilities by providing a civilian investigative staff, the benefit of a hearing record, and the findings of a hearing officer in disciplinary cases arising out of citizen complaints.

Proposition A will not cripple the police in fighting crime. It does not change the police officer’s authority to take necessary steps, including use of reasonable force, to apprehend criminal suspects.

For professional law enforcement, a stronger Police Commission and more public confidence in the S.F.P.D., vote Yes on A.

Submitted by:
Bar Association of San Francisco
Barristers Club of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Vote Yes on Proposition A

I urge you to vote for the Office of Citizen Complaints. Vote YES on Prop. A.

Doris M. Ward
Member, Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION A

Reject Moscone-Milk “killer-cop” Dan White: YES on “A” ... Defeat BART Board’s Eugene Garfinkle (whom Dan White ballot-sponsored in 1978).

— MOSCON MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB
Leland Tam
PRESIDENT OF MOSCON MEMORIAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

REPUBLICAN COMMITTEEEMEN OPPOSE!
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri
— Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner
— David Sigal

Don’t demoralize policemen!!! VOTE NO.
Robert Silvestri
— BART Candidate
(Republican Committeeman)
Terence Faulkner
(Republican Committeeman)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

This is another ludicrous Hayden-Fonda "Committee for Economic Democracy" proposal embraced and sponsored locally by Supervisors Harry Britt and Nancy Walker. This charter amendment would add a totally redundant additional layer of bureaucracy to municipal government; $625,000 worth of "fat" AP-POINTIVE jobs the FIRST year!

It is absolutely irrational! The described functions of the "POLICE COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT" are precisely the Charter designated responsibilities of our EXISTING Police Commission; a commission that has recently redoubled it's efforts to satisfy ALL citizen complaints promptly.

Surely our numerical minority of leftist Supervisors can "dream up" more creative ways to THROW AWAY $625,000 each year, FOREVER! We urge a NO vote

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION A

Vote NO on Proposition A

The concept of this proposal is not a new one, but rather a product of the 1960's that has been abolished in nearly every major metropolitan police department in the country. Similar proposals have proven to be ineffective and costly without any discernible benefit to the department or the community in cities where these proposals have been tried.

The proponents of Proposition A would like our citizens to believe that complaints of misconduct against your police officers are not being investigated properly, and that disciplinary action is not being administered. These assertions are misleading, and in fact, incorrect. As a direct result of complaints lodged against police officers during the past six years, over six hundred officers have been reprimanded, suspend- and terminated by the Chief or the Police Com- mission.

Recent changes within the police department now provide that all investigations are reviewed or re-investigated by a senior civilian investigator as well as reviewed by five Civilian Police Commissioners. These newly installed safeguards are working to the satisfac- tion of our citizens, as well as providing a sound me- chanism for the effective administration of discipline.

SUCCESS DOES NOT COME EASY. Why add another layer of bureaucracy that will have an initial cost of $625,000 that will rise dramatically year after year. Proposition A may sound like a "cure-all", but as an Administrator with thirty years of experience, I believe that this proposal is ill-conceived and will have little if any benefit to the citizens we are serv- ing.

Vote NO on Proposition A

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
Muni Acquisitions

PROPOSITION B
Shall the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures and equipment be removed from the limitation that capital cost items shall not exceed ¾ of 1 cent of each $100 of assessed value of taxable property and the requirement that acquisitions exceeding this amount be acquired by the issuance of bonds?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The budget for the Municipal Railway (Muni) may not include money for capital costs for more than ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property. When capital costs are more than this limit, the extra money needed must be raised by the sale of bonds.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition B would remove the present limit of ¾ of one cent on each $100 of taxable property when budgeting for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other necessary equipment.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to remove the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the present limit on the City’s ability to budget for revenue-producing vehicles and related structures and equipment for the Municipal Railway (Muni).

Controller’s Statement on “B”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition B:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not, in and of itself, affect the cost of government.

How Supervisors Voted on “B”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition B on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION B BEGINS ON PAGE 87.
Muni Acquisitions

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to move quickly to buy the necessary additional vehicles for the Muni and thus relieve the heavy overcrowding on some of our heaviest travelled lines.

Presently, a section of the Charter dating back to 1932 requires that we use expensive Bond funds for the Muni’s capital needs. That may have made sense then, but it does not make sense fifty years later. All it does is to tie our hands, forcing us to use a slower and far more expensive way of getting busses on the streets than is necessary.

Everyone would agree that paying for what we buy out of current revenues is far cheaper than to be forced into long term borrowing at today’s astronomical interest rates, yet, unless you vote YES on “B” we will be forced to borrow money to pay for Muni buses even while we have the cash on hand to pay for them right now.

Your YES on “B” vote will allow us to buy vehicles to relieve the terrible overcrowding on many Muni lines as soon as we have the funds to do so. And the funds are on hand, yet they cannot be used to buy the busses, trolleys and trains we need unless Proposition B passes.

I believe that the Muni’s need for vehicles is critical and immediate. I hope that you join me in voting YES on “B” so that we may quickly and economically move to replace and increase the Muni’s fleet.

VOTE YES ON “B”.
Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION B

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION B

An obsolete Charter provision prevents the City from buying a fleet of buses to relieve our overcrowding on the Muni Railway. It is a 50-year-old roadblock that obstructs solutions to present-day transit needs in our city. Removing this antiquated legal barrier will enable the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to deal more effectively with today’s urgent transit needs. Vote yes for progress.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP B WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

¡SUPER OFERTA!

Unicamente por el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre de 1982, usted puede desempeñar el cargo de juez, ganando $43, o como inspector, ganando $52. Si usted es ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sabe inglés y español, o sabe inglés solamente, obtenga una solicitud, personalmente, en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de San Francisco en la Avenida Van Ness y Calle Grove.
PROPOSITION C

Shall the Board of Supervisors be authorized to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to acquire, construct and improve facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and other uses with repayment by the private parties and creating no debt or liability on the City?

Analysis

By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: There is no authority in the San Francisco Charter that allows the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties to finance industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition C would allow the Board of Supervisors to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in financing the acquisition, construction, improvement, and equipping of facilities for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses. The repayment of the bonds or notes would be made by the private parties. The bonds or notes would create no liability or debt for the City. They would not obligate the Board of Supervisors to levy any taxes or make any appropriation for their repayment. The issuance of the bonds or notes is not subject to a vote of the people.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the Board of Supervisors to have the authority to issue bonds or notes to assist private parties in industrial development.

Controller’s Statement on “C”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition C:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would not affect the cost of government.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROPOSITION C APPEARS ON PAGE 88.

How Supervisors Voted on “C”

On August 16 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition C on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON C

As the author of the legislation which allowed San Francisco to take advantage of a new State law that, for the first time, permitted local governmental entities to make use of industrial development bonds, I urge you to vote Yes on Prop. C.

This will enable the City to market such bonds by itself rather than be forced to utilize cumbersome State procedures.

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION C

Proposition C would help us attract and retain industry in San Francisco and thus to provide the jobs that go with economic development.

Proposition C would allow the City and County to sponsor the issuance of Industrial Development Bonds. The proceeds of these tax free bonds would be used exclusively to help finance additional industrial and commercial businesses which will generate both “blue collar” and “white collar” jobs for our people.

Due to today's high interest rates, many local businesses cannot expand. Many persons wishing to develop industrial complexes or businesses cannot do so. Proposition C would allow the City to issue tax exempt bonds and to lend the proceeds on a long term basis to qualified applicants. Thus, new jobs which we so desperately need for San Franciscans will be generated.

The taxpayers of the City have absolutely no risk in these bonds. The purchaser of the bonds looks exclusively to the borrower for repayment. Hundreds of other cities throughout the land are now helping small businesses and helping themselves by using this method of creating industrial growth and jobs. It is high time we join them and put an end to a competitive disadvantage which we now suffer.

For Jobs... Vote Yes on C.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION C

Tax exempt industrial development bonds are used by municipalities, nationwide, to attract new industry and commercial development to their cities. (Some even grant ten-year property tax moratoriums!).

San Francisco has been remiss in its past failure to utilize this government-sponsored financial tool in fostering local development of increased industrial activity.

This Charter Amendment permits San Francisco's Industrial Development Authority to SPONSOR these bond issues for local small business firms. The “full faith and credit” of San Francisco is not in jeopardy and the City is not, in any way, liable for repayment of these bonds.

This measure will mean more “blue collar” jobs for San Franciscans and an increase in our property tax base. It will reduce San Francisco's dependence upon tourist business.

Vote “YES” on Proposition C.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION C

Don't give the Supervisors a blank check. Vote “NO”!!!

Bob Geary
BART Board Candidate (Democratic Committeeman)

Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman
Terence Faulkner
Former City Commissioner
PROPOSITION D
Shall the city subsidize the surviving spouse of active and retired employees on the same basis that the city subsidizes the active or retired employees in the Health Service System?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The City contributes to a Health Service System Fund for active and retired employees. The City does not contribute anything for spouses of active or retired employees. The City's contribution equals the average amount contributed to health service plans for each employee of the ten most populated California counties except San Francisco.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition D would provide that the City contribute to the Health Service System Fund for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee. The surviving spouse must have been married to the employee for at least one year prior to the employee's death. The amount of the contribution would be the same as that made by the City to the Health Service System Fund for active and retired employees.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you do not want the City to contribute to the Health Service System for the surviving spouse of an active or retired city employee.

Controller's Statement on "D"
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition D:
Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $579,000.

How Supervisors Voted on "D"
On July 12 the Board of Supervisors voted 7-2 on the question of placing Proposition D on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: Supervisors Quentin Kopp and Carol Ruth Silver.

NOTE
Your polling place location may have changed. Please refer to the arrow on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

The city now contributes part of the cost of providing health care to active and retired employees of the City & County. The subsidy ends on the death of the employee.

PROPOSITION D provides for an extension of the city aid to the surviving spouse to help them meet ever-increasing medical and hospital costs.

PROPOSITION D insures that the surviving spouses SHALL PAY AS MUCH BUT NOT MORE for health care than that charged those active and retired employees who fortunately have not suffered the loss of their loved ones. The number of surviving spouses involved is approximately 1200 and the cost is minimal.

It is particularly gratifying to surviving spouses that the Health Services System trustees, the Board of Supervisors and citizen groups throughout the community have enthusiastically endorsed PROPOSITION D.

On behalf of our deserving surviving spouses, the organization of Retired Employees of the City & County strongly urges YES ON PROPOSITION D.

Gerald Gallagher, President
Retired Employees City, County of San Francisco

Endorsed by:

John L. Molinari
Louise H. Renne
Richard D. Hongisto
Lee Dolton
Wendy Nelder
Carol Ruth Silver
Harry G. Briti
Nancy G. Walker
Willie B. Kennedy
Doris M. Ward
F. Walter Johnson

Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Board of Supervisors
Pres. Health Service Board

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION D

This Charter Amendment, if successful, will lighten the heavy financial load being shouldered by the category “Surviving Spouse” in the Health Service System. A situation that should have been corrected years ago. These individuals, either husband or wife, must continue to carry on alone, rearing a family, fighting inflation and just striving to survive.

When the City worker passes on, the first jolt the surviving spouse receives is 50% (one-half) of the retirement benefits, and this only if the employee was qualified for retirement, otherwise the survivor receives only what was contributed to the retirement system by the deceased.

The next setback is the withdrawal of City subsidy for Health Care — the fight for survival becomes more intense.

There are but 1200 individuals in this category — the cost to the taxpayer to partially subsidize their health plan is insignificant.

Compassion is the word. The voters of this City have always helped the underdog. We urge you to help this small group with a “YES” vote.

Unanimously endorsed by the Health Service Board. Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION D WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION E
Shall the surviving spouse of a member of the Retirement System who is receiving a retirement allowance be allowed to continue to receive the allowance upon remarriage after age 60?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Retirement System for City employees pays retirement benefits to the surviving spouse of a member of the System. This retirement payment stops when the surviving spouse remarries.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition E provides that a City employee’s surviving spouse, aged 60 or older, who remarries would continue to receive retirement benefits unless the surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee. Retirement payments which stopped when a surviving spouse remarried shall start again, unless the surviving spouse remarried before age 60 or married a retired or active City employee. The surviving spouse will not be paid for the time between remarriage and the date this Proposition becomes effective. Retirement benefits would stop if the surviving spouse remarries a second time.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want the retirement benefits to continue for a City employee’s surviving spouse who remarries after reaching age 60, unless that surviving spouse marries an active or retired City employee.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the retirement benefits to stop when the surviving spouse remarries.

Controller’s Statement on “E”
City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition E:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, there would be an increase in the cost of government, the amount of which cannot be accurately determined, but should be substantial.

How Supervisors Voted on “E”
On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition E on the ballot.
The Supervisors voted as follows:
NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Be sure to check the location of your polling place on the back cover of this pamphlet.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

At present many retired city employees are living on very small pensions. When death takes their mate they are left alone with an income that in many cases is pitifully small. When the widows and widowers of these deserving retired city employees who have given so much to this city reach this sad state, they should at least be able to remarry and retain their retirement allowances — after all, they helped earn it. If we can find any of the milk of human kindness in ourselves we certainly should find it in ourselves to be kind to these retired widows and widowers!

Vote yes on E.

Supervisor Richard D. Hongisto

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION E

Under existing statutes in San Francisco, the widow of a City employee cannot remarry and continue to receive the reduced retirement allowance as the benefit-sharing spouse of the employee. The penalty for remarriage (termination of the allowance for the remainder of their life) was based on the age-old concept in pension plans of one "provider" and one "dependent" in a marriage. In our present day society, threatened or actual loss of a guaranteed retirement benefit for any reason is viewed as an infringement on the freedom of an individual to choose her/his own lifestyle. The penalty would be a particularly cruel restriction on those elderly surviving spouses who would hope to rebuild their shattered lives in the companionship of a second marriage in their later years. It is noteworthy that the Social Security, the Federal Employees Retirement and Railroad Retirement Systems now allow the surviving spouse to remarry at age 60 without terminating their retirement allowance. Proponents of Proposition "E" are asking the voters of San Francisco in this legislation to abolish the discriminatory regulation relating to the continuation of retirement benefits for surviving spouses. In meetings with committees of the Board of Supervisors, agreement was reached on certain revisions which are included in the text of the finally approved Charter Amendment and which specify that: A SURVIVING SPOUSE AT OR AFTER AGE 60 CAN REMARRY ONE TIME ONLY AND PROVIDING FURTHER THAT THERE CAN BE NO RETROACTIVE PAYMENTS OR BENEFITS PAID TO SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Vote "YES" on Proposition E.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION E

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

As a Retired City Employee I urge all voters to end discrimination for surviving spouses.

Having had 44 years of service, and paying my share to provide a continued allowance for my spouse in the event of death, which would continue for the remaining years of my spouse's life, without any extra funding for her benefit. If the desire is to remarry and provide the comfort of security and companionship and safety, so be it.

Why penalize a person and take away the allowance that already has been funded and provided? Only one remarriage after age 60 would be allowed and no retroactive funds would be paid.

The Social Security, the Federal and Railroad Retirement Systems allow remarriage after age 60.

The Controller Farrell, Quote: "The costs cannot be accurately determined."

Spousal Retirement benefits, the spokesman said "Quote" "The eventual costs are difficult to peg because it's a new field. We have no actuarial data."

"We also do not know how many people the plan would affect."

The Data Processing have the information on every active, retired and beneficiary to provide how many it would affect.

The Chief Actuary retired July, 1982 and stated that the cost should be minimal.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION E

Submitted by:

William T. Reed
PAST PRESIDENT S.F. RETIREMENT BOARD
PAST PRESIDENT RETIRED EMPLOYEES CITY & COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Supervisors’ Salary

PROPOSITION G
Shall each member of the Board of Supervisors be paid a salary of $23,924 per year?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The Board of Supervisors consists of eleven members. Each member of the Board is paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition G provides that each of the eleven members of the Board of Supervisors would be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to be paid a salary of $23,924 per year.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want each member of the Board of Supervisors to continue to be paid a salary of $9,600 per year.

Controller’s Statement on “G”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition G:

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $157,564.

How Supervisors Voted on “G”

On July 26 the Board of Supervisors voted 11-0 on the question of placing Proposition G on the ballot. The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION G

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

2.100 Composition and Salary

The board of supervisors shall consist of 11 members elected at large. Each member of the board shall be paid a salary of ((($9,600)) $23,924 per year and each shall execute an official bond to the city and county in the sum of $5,000. (End)
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

G MEANS GOOD GOVERNMENT

Good government requires good people. But, as any recruitment officer or personnel director will tell you, you can only attract good people if you have a reasonable and updated compensation schedule.

San Francisco voters recognized that fact back in 1964 when they voted to increase the Board of Supervisors salary to $9600 — an amount that exceeded the then $8345 average salary of supervisors in the other nine Bay Area counties.

Today, almost two decades later, San Francisco’s supervisors still receive the same $9600. In contrast, the average salary of the supervisors in the other Bay Area counties increased to $25,931. While the salary of San Francisco’s supervisors has remained stagnant, the Board’s responsibilities have become manifestly more serious and significant. In 1964, the Board of Supervisors dealt with a $276,000,000 budget. The budget for 1982-83 is approximately $1,330,000,000.

Such financial responsibility requires talent and expertise — attributes which many constituents recall having been represented in greater abundance on Boards of the past when the $9600 salary meant something. But what kind of talent can you expect to attract with a salary that today allows a family of four to qualify for food stamps?

VOTE YES ON G

Prop G will increase supervisors’ salaries to $23,924:

—This is the amount, as certified by the Budget Analyst, that supervisors would be earning currently if their 1964 salaries had kept pace with the most conservative Consumer Price Index, compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor.

—This is an amount that is under but still consistent with the $25,931 average for supervisors’ pay in the other Bay Area counties.

—This is an amount that has been offset by some $70,000 in cuts to the Board recently made in its own budget.

—This is an amount that will encourage better qualified candidates, whose values we share, to run for the Board.

FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT VOTE YES ON G

Submitted by:
Supervisor Quentin L. Kopp

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

A Supervisor currently makes $9,600.00 a year. His or her Administrative Assistant makes $23,672.00 and the Legislative Aide makes $23,070.00.

This is incredible when Supervisors in other jurisdictions are making over fifty thousand dollars a year!

To do this job effectively requires a minimum of forty hours a week. Conscientious Supervisors must devote every weekend reviewing pounds of documents delivered to their homes every Friday afternoon so they can be totally familiar with the issues to be debated the following Monday. They must also attend eight committee meetings a month. The balance of their time is devoted to satisfying constituent’s complaints, preparing legislation, and hopefully devoting a few hours towards earning some outside “part-time” income.

As matters now stand, only the independently wealthy, or wild-eyed irrational zealots, driven by an insatiable desire for political power, aspire to this office.

We will never be able to attract credible, highly intelligent, competent businesslike candidates for Supervisor while the salary remains so penurious.

Remember, this Board is running a $1.3 billion dollar a year corporation for you! While $23,924 a year is certainly no princely sum, at least the officeholders no longer will be eligible for welfare and food stamps at the modest increase in salary being proposed. This is tax money well spent! Vote YES!

W. F. O'Keefe, Sr., President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

Eighteen years ago salaries were set for members of the Board of Supervisors at $9,600 per year. Because of inflation the purchasing power of this salary has actually dwindled to $3,200 per year. With no health insurance, no retirement benefits, no per diem, essentially no extra income or benefits from serving as Supervisor, our representatives on the Board face a very real financial burden.

As a past member of the Board of Supervisors, I realize that the job is virtually impossible unless an individual has an outside source of income. This fact of life eliminates a large number of people of average means from even considering running for this office. Also, the demands of being a responsible Supervisor dictate that there is little or no time to moonlight on another job.

I strongly urge you to correct this financial imbalance by voting YES ON G. After 18 years, it's the responsible thing to do.

Dianne Feinstein

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION G

The San Francisco City Charter requires that any pay increase to be given members of the Board of Supervisors, must be approved by the voters. The Supervisors’ current salary of $9,600 per year was granted by the voters in 1967. It is clearly time to consider an increase.

Proposition G is a simple straightforward pay raise based on inflation. It has no fancy formulas or hidden benefits. Voters retain the right to grant any future increases.

The current salary of $9,600 per year requires an unreasonable sacrifice by those who serve in that office. A higher salary would encourage more citizens of average means to seek public office. Vote YES on Proposition G.

Gregory Hurst
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

VOTE YES ON G

In the past 50 years there have been only two increases in the original $2400 salary of supervisors established by the 1932 Charter: 1) in 1956 when the electorate doubled the pay to $4800 and 2) in 1964 when the pay was increased to the current $9600 level. No other increase has been made in the almost two decades which have since elapsed. Now, the effects of inflation have reduced the buying power of that $9600 to a mere $3958 making what was once a respectable salary a mere “token.”

By not changing the salary of supervisors to reflect the increases in living expenses which have occurred over the past 18 years, San Francisco is selling itself short in terms of the quality of people it attracts to run for its Board of Supervisors.

Taxpayers in the other eight Bay Area counties have long recognized the need to have their supervisors’ salaries keep abreast of inflation. The average salary in the neighboring jurisdictions today is $25,931. While these other counties have only five supervisors, all have city council members in profusion. Thus, the taxpayers in these counties pay far more for their local legislators, including council members (an average of $277,500 in salaries and fringes per county) than San Francisco’s taxpayers whose 11 supervisors act as both a city council and county legislature and whose combined salaries and fringes total only $111,485.

VOTE YES ON “G”

MAKE A LONG OVERDUE ONE-TIME COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN SUPERVISORS’ SALARIES.

Michael Laderman
San Francisco Common Cause
Kamini Gupta
William Reed
Sam Duca
Cynthia Landi
Catherine Sconlon
James Stark
William Murray
Emmett Condon
Alessandro Baccari
Nicholas Sapunar
William Best
Priscilla Scannell
Dennis Atenore
Valerie Pope
Janet Wentworth
Don Kates
Leo Murphy
Frank Aiello
Victorino Hermosa
Willis Hannawalt
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

The last salary change for members of the Board of Supervisors was nearly 20 years ago. Right: during that period there has been no increase in the salary of San Francisco Supervisors. The result of inflation over the past 20 years is that what $9,600 (that's the salary of your Supervisors) would buy in 1964 now buys only about $3,500 worth of groceries.

Approving this increase in Supervisors’ pay is reasonable, fair, and is a way to insure good government in San Francisco. Average San Franciscans would consider serving on the Board of Supervisors — but at the current salary, they can’t. This proposed increase does not even make up for inflation. But it would make it possible for people who are not independently rich — people who have to support themselves by working — also to be Supervisors.

For San Franciscans to be assured that high quality people — people who are well-equipped to run this City as it should be run — will continue to be elected to the Board of Supervisors it is necessary that they not have to take a vow of poverty to serve their City.

This proposal would increase the salary of Supervisors to $23,924 per year. This is a hard and fast figure, and it cannot be increased by anyone but the voters of San Francisco. It will allow the voters to continue to have the control over the salary of the Board of Supervisors.

San Francisco Supervisors at $9,600 per year get less than any of the other nine Bay Area counties. The salaries for Supervisors range from $16,500 in Napa County to $35,771 in San Mateo County.

Voting YES ON G will make sure that good and hard-working San Franciscans can afford to be members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. It is the way to be sure that we don’t have government for and by only the independently wealthy.

Vote YES ON “G”.

Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

YES ON G

We, the citizens of the neighborhoods of San Francisco, support a salary increase for the members of the Board of Supervisors to reflect the cost of living increases that have occurred over the past 18 years.

Robert and Cheryl Arenson
Judith Thorson
Martin A. Fellhauer
Camilie F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sovzi
Maxine and Walter Cromble
David and Carol Mullin
Alvystus J. Smyth
Joan Willenssen
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emolin Codis
Harry Sedon
Henry Jebe
Harry and Marge Stein
Albert and Mary Groth

Evelyn Stanfield
Isabelle Burns
Thomas and Mary De Natale
John and Ann Halla
Edward O'Donnell
Thomas and Margaret Carroll
Frank and Bessie Flaherty
Mary Kane
Margaret Farbstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibach
Dorothy Nissley
Caroline Benn
Eleanor Davis
Rory Flood
Gail Inlander

Ramona Dougherty
Josephine B. Ramos
Martha and Maurice Wolohan
Lawrence V. Epinette
Ann Fogelberg
Doug and Joan Fenton
Margot McCormick
Barbara Lee Marie Elvander
Frank and Maud Carl
Rita Dallmont
Hazel Laine
Dora Gonzales
Francis and Geraldine Shannon
Marian Woods
Mary Bottom
Katherine Fogarty
Joseph A. Carew
A.J. Kane
Anne McHale
Carole Allston
Stephen Garbaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Muffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavallini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Martel
Frank Naccaraio
Ruth Passe
Enola Maxwell
Hal Czuzan
Walter G. Jebe
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerald Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Lucchello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nongjor
Frances Condon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Glyn
Walter and Bern Foyling
Richard and Evelyn Wilson
Robert Todd
Lloyd and Verna Ricci
Loma Follett
William McGrath

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Supervisors’ Salary

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION G

As San Franciscans we are long overdue in addressing the issue of Supervisor’s salaries. A yes vote on PROPOSITION G is, simply, the responsible thing for us to do.

THE PROBLEM

• The salary for members of the Board of Supervisors has not been raised from $9,600 per year since 1964. During the past 18 years the cost of living has tripled; as a consequence the actual purchasing power of the current salary is roughly $3,200 per year (if housing costs are included in the inflation factor).

• Present members of the Board of Supervisors, although highly qualified, may not be able to continue to serve unless we do something now to correct the financial hardship this imposes. In addition, highly qualified candidates, in the future, may not be able to run for the Board of Supervisors and serve the city.

• People of average means cannot afford to run and serve on the Board of Supervisors because the current salary is so out of line with what it costs to get by today.

THE SOLUTION

• A realistic cost of living increase based on an amount somewhat less than the actual inflation rate.

• Action on this issue by passing Proposition G before we get further and further behind compounding the problems now facing us.

A yes vote on G will resolve an 18-year-old problem and get us back on the track of good government in San Francisco. Join me in voting YES ON G, after 18 years it’s the responsible thing to do.

Cyril Magrain

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Vote NO on “G”

Are you aware what it takes to operate our present Board of Supervisors? Thirty-three persons with an annual salary of $600,952.

Let’s break it down:

Eleven supervisors at $800 per month — $9,600 annually 11 x $9,600 $105,600

Eleven administrative aides at $1960 per month — $23,582 annually times 11 259,402

Eleven legislative aides at 1786 per month — $21,450 annually times 11 235,950

Total $600,952

If they would eliminate one member of their staff the taxpayers could afford an increase for a part-time supervisor. However, there is no indication in the proposition that this might occur. If it is not in writing, it is not valid.

VOTE NO ON “G”

Edna Mae Martin
Senior Citizen

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

Why not limousines?
Why not yachts?
Why not Elizabeth Ray?
Vote “NO”!!!

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION G

What QUENTIN KOPP said about Proposition J (a defeated 1980 measure to raise Supervisors’ pay to 25% of the Mayor’s salary): “The City is facing a dire financial crisis ... Proposition J ... is the wrong idea at the wrong time.”

Proposition J would have given Supervisors a 61% pay hike in 1980. Proposition G will grant them a 120% pay increase now. Like Proposition J, G is the wrong idea at the wrong time.

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican Committeeman)
— Terence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
"Miscellaneous" Employees’ Retirement

PROPOSITION H
Shall the contribution rate for miscellaneous city employees to the Retirement System be fixed at 7½% of the compensation of these employees?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: City employees pay a percentage of their salaries to the City’s Retirement System. For city employees hired before November 2, 1976, the amount of the payment is based on several factors. They include the age of the employee at the time of employment, an assumed retirement age of 60, and a total contribution from the employee that will pay one half the pension. The amount of the employee’s contribution changes according to economic conditions and actuarial surveys.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition H provides that city employees who joined the Retirement System before November 2, 1976, would pay a fixed 7½% of their pay to the City’s Retirement System. This proposition does not apply to police officers and firefighters, who are members of separate retirement plans.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a fixed 7½% of their salaries to the Retirement System.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want city employees who were hired before November 2, 1976, to pay a flexible amount into the Retirement System. This amount is figured on an individual basis.

Controller’s Statement on “H”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition “H.”

Should the proposed Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $630,000 commencing July 1, 1983.

How Supervisors Voted on “H”

On August 2 the Board of Supervisors voted 10-0 on the question of placing Proposition H on the ballot.

The Supervisors voted as follows:


NO: None of the Supervisors present voted “No.”

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP H BEGINS ON PAGE 62

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see “arrow”).

61
"Miscellaneous" Employees' Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION H

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H

Proposition H is designed to provide stability and uniformity in the setting of employee rates of contribution to the Retirement System.

The Retirement System currently administers six separate pension plans, five of which provide "Fixed" employee rates of contribution. The remaining plan, covering some 11,000 miscellaneous members, provides for fluctuating, varied rates of contribution based on "age at entry" into the plan.

Basing rates of contribution on "age at entry" is an out-dated method. The Retirement Board's Consulting Actuary has advised the Board that a "fixed" rate of contribution would better serve both the members of the System and the taxpayers of San Francisco. Currently, "age at entry" rates are affected by actuarial and economic assumptions, which are subject to continuous change with each valuation of the System.

Proposition H will preclude these continuous changes. It will set the rate at 7½% for members covered under Section 8.509, a rate greater than that paid by all other members of the System. It will provide proper funding of the System by allowing the City's rate to be set without interference created by the current choice of assumptions on member rates. More importantly for San Francisco taxpayers, there will be savings in the future resulting from the simplification of the plan. Those savings cannot be estimated at this time but such savings could be greater than the projected initial years' cost.

Proposition H will bring San Francisco into line with other major public employee plans which have changed to fixed employee rates of contribution, including the California State Public Employees Retirement System, the State Teachers' Retirement System and other major California cities.

Proposition H will provide an equitable, fair and responsible method for setting member rates of contributions. Proposition H will relieve taxpayers of unnecessary and expensive administrative and actuarial cost.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION H.
Submitted by the Board of Supervisors.

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP H WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION H

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.509 Retirement — Miscellaneous Officers and Employees On and After July 1, 1947.

Miscellaneous officers and employees, as defined in this section, who are members of the retirement system under this section of the Charter on February 1, 1969, shall be members of the retirement system, subject to the following provisions of this section, in addition to the provisions contained in Sections 3.670, 3.672, 8.500, 8.510 and 8.520 of this charter notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of the charter, provided that the retirement system shall be applied to persons employed on a part-time, temporary or substitute basis only as the board of supervisors shall determine by ordinance enacted by three-fourth vote of all members of the board. Miscellaneous officers and employees of the said departments who are members of the retirement system under section 8.507 of the charter on February 1, 1969 shall continue to be members of the system under section 8.507 and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of this section, except as specifically provided in this section.

(A) 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 he worked, throughout the period under consideration,

(Continued on page 90)
Police Retirement

PROPOSITION I
Shall a new Retirement and Disability Plan be created for uniformed members of the Police Department hired after November 1, 1982, with rights of members of the present plans to transfer to the new plan?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: San Francisco police officers belong to one of two different plans that cover retirement, disability and death benefits. Officers become eligible for retirement benefits at the age of 50, after a minimum of 25 years of service.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition I creates a new retirement and disability plan for police officers. Officers hired after November 1, 1982, would belong to this plan. Officers hired before November 1, 1982, would be able to change from their present retirement and disability plan to the new one.

Under the new plan officers could retire after 20 years of service. There would be no minimum age requirement for benefits.

An annual cost of living increase paid to a retired officer would equal half of the annual salary increase paid to active officers who hold the rank at which the officer retired.

Disability payments would be set on a sliding scale, depending on the severity of the disabling injury.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want a new retirement and disability plan for police officers.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want to keep the existing retirement and disability plans for police officers.

Controller’s Statement on “I”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition I:

Based on actuarial analysis by the City Retirement System, the proposed initiative Charter amendment would, in my opinion, increase the cost of government by approximately $17 million.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP I BEGINS ON PAGE 94.

How Prop I Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition I had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 27,932 signatures which they turned into the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,820 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I (November 2, 1976), which passed by a slim margin of the vote (5%) reduced retirement/disability benefits for police officers hired after that date. Over 40% of the sworn officers in the department today receive substantially lower benefits than their peers hired prior to 1976.

In a 1979 Federal Court Decree, guidelines were established regarding the hiring practices of the Civil Service Commission and the San Francisco Police Department pertaining to women and minorities. Goals were established to insure their fair representation within the department. It is precisely these people however, who have been adversely affected by the reduction of benefits contained in Prop. I.

Nearly 30,000 voters in San Francisco recently signed petitions in favor of putting Proposition I on the November ballot. Prop. I would correct the inequity of having two officers who perform the same difficult and often dangerous duties compensated at two substantially different levels. In addition, it would rectify survival (spouse and/or dependents) benefits currently being offered for those who die in the line of duty.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A yes vote on Proposition I will raise future police officers to the same level of disability and retirement benefits as officers hired before November 1976. We now have two disability and retirement systems for the Police Department — one being substantially inferior to the other, despite the reality that all officers perform the same duties under the same difficult circumstances. Prop. I will unify the present system, providing equal treatment for all officers.

Vote yes on Prop. I.

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly Assemblyman, 17th District
Doris Ward
 Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

Proposition I will have a great influence on the future of the San Francisco Police Department. As your Assemblyman, I have always focused my efforts in the areas of equality for every person. Most people are unaware of the division within the ranks of the San Francisco Police Department. The department is now recruiting women and minority candidates to enter as new officers; yet upon being hired, they are not afforded the same retirement protections, or disability benefits when injuries are sustained, as senior officers. This is not fair as they are providing us with the same quality law enforcement as senior officers. When Proposition I passes, it will create a fair and just system of retirement and disability within our police department.

Art Agnos
State Assemblyman
16th District

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Retirement

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION I

A Yes vote on Proposition I is a must if San Francisco professes to treat the minority members of San Francisco Police Department in an equitable manner. Under the current pension system being offered by the city, all the officers who joined the Department after 1976 are subjected to lower compensation than those who had joined prior. Minority officers are being affected disproportionately due to the fact that the majority of them were hired after 1976.

The city and county is having difficulty retaining its officers due to its inability to compete with other jurisdictions which offers better compensation. The minority officers of San Francisco are being actively recruited by other jurisdictions which desires their sensitivity and ability to handle minority problems. As a result, many San Francisco trained minority officers have joined the ranks of other jurisdictions. It cost approximately $30,000 to successfully train a new officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new pension plan. Please vote yes on Proposition I to correct the present inequity and save the city money.

Nelson Lum
President
Northern California Asian Peace Officers Association

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION I

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committee)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP I WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

LOOKING FOR WORK? LOOK NO FURTHER!

Help citizens to vote on election day, November 2nd.
Bilingual workers are especially needed. Apply in Rm. 155 City Hall.

¿BUSCA TRABAJO? ¡NO BUSQUE MAS!

Ayude a los ciudadanos a votar el día de las elecciones, el 2 de noviembre. Se necesitan personas bilingües especialmente. Obtenga una solicitud en la Oficina 155 de la Alcaldía de la Ciudad.
Police Overtime

PROPOSITION J
Shall Police Officers be paid at the rate of time and one-half or be given time off duty at the rate of time and one-half for overtime or holiday work as requested by the officer?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: When a police officer works overtime or works on a holiday, the officer gets one hour's pay for each extra hour worked or gets one hour off for each extra hour worked.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition J provides that when a police officer works overtime or on a holiday the officer shall be paid for time and one-half or shall be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked. The officer may choose to be paid or to take the time off.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of time and one-half or to be given time off at the rate of one and one-half hours for each hour worked.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want police officers to be paid for overtime or holidays worked at the rate of one hour's pay or one hour off for each extra hour worked.

Controller's Statement on "J"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition J:

Should the proposed initiative Charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by approximately $1,250,000.

How Prop J Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition J had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

The Police Officers Association, proponents of the initiative petition, had gathered 29,010 signatures which they turned in to the Registrar on August 4th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 24,860 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 22,547 signatures needed to qualify an initiative Charter amendment for the ballot.

NOTE
Your polling place location appears on the back cover of this pamphlet (see "arrow").

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP J APPEARS ON PAGE 99
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

PROPOSAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION FOR BALLOT INITIATIVE

Time & One Half for Overtime & Holiday

The members of the San Francisco Police Department are requesting a change in the rate of pay Sworn Officers receive for working overtime and holidays.

Sworn Officers currently receive straight time for working overtime and holidays. Proposition J will increase this rate of pay from straight time to time and one half for every hour of overtime or holiday they work.

Time and one half is a justified compensation for the work our police officers perform. In addition, time and one half for overtime and holidays is the common rate of pay for many police departments in this state. Increasing overtime and holiday benefits for San Francisco police officers will help our department maintain a competitive edge with other police departments in this state.

The San Francisco Police Department is currently losing many of their officers every year, many of whom are transferring to other departments that offer better benefit packages. If we are to keep our well trained police officers in San Francisco, we need to provide adequate compensation for the work they perform. I encourage you to join me in supporting Proposition J.

VOTE YES ON PROP. J

Leo McCarthy
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
Gordon Lau
Former S.F. Supervisor

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Art Agus
State Assemblyman
16th District
Chuck Ayal
Director C.Y.O.
Philip Burton
Member of Congress
5th Congressional District
John Foran
State Senator
6th District
Jo Daly
San Francisco Police Commissioner

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Vote Yes on Proposition J

Proposition J is a simple issue of allowing our police officers to be paid at the same rate of pay for overtime as other city and state law enforcement agencies. These dedicated people deserve to be treated equally and fairly. Proposition J is equal and fair.

Please join with me by voting yes on Proposition J.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Willie Lewis Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
Assembly
Doris M. Ward
Supervisor
C/C San Francisco

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

Dear Concerned Citizen:

I would like to ask your support for Proposition J. This measure would bring the San Francisco Police Department up to the standards the City has set for other City employees. Proposition J will allow members of the Police Department who work overtime and holidays to be paid at the same rate as street sweepers, plumbers and other City employees. A Yes vote will bring equality to the Police Department.

Join me with a Yes Vote on Proposition J. Show our devoted officers that they are as important as other City employees.

Cornelius P. Murphy
Chief of Police

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Police Overtime

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION J

Put yourself in the uniform of the San Francisco Police Officer for just one moment. You have now just joined one of the finest major police departments in the United States. We deal with every major crime imaginable on a daily basis. We have a tremendous work load that requires our officers to work over their normal eight hour day and on holidays. Crime knows no time limitations or holidays, yet our officers rise to meet the challenges every time crime rears its ugly head. The Charter, written decades ago, prohibits these dedicated officers from receiving time and one half pay for overtime or holidays. Proposition J will change the charter and compensate the police officer for holidays and overtime worked at the same rate as all other local police departments and the same as most other city employees.

San Francisco Police Officers Association
Bob Barry, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION J

FIGHT CRIME! Vote “YES”!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary
(Democratic Committeeman)

Democratic Committeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeman Terence Faulkner

NO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP J WAS SUBMITTED

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
Electric Utility Ownership

PROPOSITION K
Shall the Board of Supervisors take enumerated steps and cause a feasibility study to be made to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco and place the acquisition of said utility to the voters at the general election held after a study is completed?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The company that provides electricity for San Francisco is privately owned. The Charter provides that public utilities can be acquired and owned by the city.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition K would begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco. The process includes public hearings to determine what will be included in a study. The study would include the cost to acquire the facilities, revenues, consumer rates, management and how the ownership change would take place. The Public Utilities Commission will award the contract for the study, which is to be completed by June 10, 1984. When the study is completed, the voters, at the next general election, will decide if the city will acquire and operate the electric utility.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to begin a process to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the electric utility that serves San Francisco to continue under private ownership.

Controller's Statement on "K"

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition K:

Should the proposed Initiative Ordinance be adopted, in my opinion, it would increase the cost of government by $500,000 to 700,000 in 1982-83 to pay for a feasibility study.

In addition this measure provides for submission of the question of acquisition of the electric utility, bond authorization and related matters at the November 1984 general election.

Based upon data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the current estimated acquisition cost of the electric system would exceed $800 million. Additional costs of condemnation, asset valuation, litigation, debt service and related items cannot be accurately determined at this time, but would be substantial.

Based upon current city debt service rates and amortization periods and data from the Pacific Gas & Electric Company, the total cost of acquisition could exceed $1.4 billion. The income to the city or lowered rates to subscribers, if any, cannot be determined at this time.

How Prop K Got on Ballot

Proposition K was an initiative ordinance. Filed on August 3, it contained 11,820 valid signatures. 9,679 signatures are needed to qualify for the ballot.

TEXT OF "K" — SEE PAGE 99
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ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Over the past five years, PG&E has raised your electricity rates 157%! Rate increases last winter caused economic hardship for many, and PG&E plans to ask for another billion dollar rate increase this fall. Additionally, cost overruns at PG&E's Diablo Canyon and Helms Creek plants will cost consumers $3 billion. If you think there must be a better way to light your home, you're right. There is.

Across America, over 2,200 communities own and operate their local electric utilities. In California 21 "public power" cities provide cheap, efficient service to their residents — often at rates less than half what PG&E charges us.

Proposition K calls for a feasibility study to determine what benefits we can expect from public ownership of our electricity system, as well as the best methods to ensure dependable, efficient, and economical service. After the completed study is publicly reviewed, we will vote on whether we want a public power system in San Francisco.

BENEFITS

Lower Rates. A municipal utility can charge lower rates than PG&E because it doesn't pay stockholder profits or advertise. And, unlike PG&E, we have no incentive to build costly plants, whose power fuels suburban sprawl, not the stable city energy market. Economies realized by the utility would go back to residents, through lower rates, decreased taxes, increased services, or all three. Decisions about our energy future and energy sources would be made publicly.

BUT CAN SAN FRANCISCO RUN AN ELECTRICITY SYSTEM?

The answer is: We already do. Since 1925 San Francisco has operated a hydroelectric plant, Hetch Hetchy, in the Sierras. Power from that plant is currently sold to other cities and industrial concerns. Our city's hydro plant is one of the most efficient in the country; if we owned the distribution system in town, Hetch Hetchy's cheap hydropower would go to city residents instead of non-city users.

We think it makes good sense to go "public power". And the first step, under law, is a thorough, impartial study. WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES to get the facts.

Vote YES on K.

SAN FRANCISCANS FOR PUBLIC POWER
Charlene Clarke, Treasurer

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Smart consumers should shop around before they decide. The following rates are current and for a typical 500 kilowatt monthly bill:

Palo Alto (public) $11.06
Redding (public) $12.35
Santa Clara (public) $14.50

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Yes on K

Gary Aaronson
Assemblyman Art Agnos
Rob Baker
Robert Barnes
Bernice Biggs
Black Political Caucus
Al Borico
Supervisor Harry Britt
Dale Butler
Lulu Caster
Manuel Ceballos
Rev. Harry Chuck, Jr.
Citizens for Representative Government
Citizens Party of San Francisco
Gene Coleman
Ina Dearman
Connie Ford

Eulalio Frausto
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zurett Goosby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallinan
Sue Hestor
Joe Hughes
Espanola Jackson
Candice Jensen
Judie Kaplan
Alison Brennan Kwasnik
David Looman

Thomas McCarthy
Leonel Uriarte Monterey
Anne Moore
Robert Moore
Arthur Morris
Jack Morrison
Nob Hill Neighbors
Michael Nolan
Richmond Involved in Safe Energy
San Francisco Democratic Club
San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee
Cynthia Sharpe
Frances Shashkin
Stanley Shields
James Sloch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sneed
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starbuck III
Peter Stern
Ida Strickland
Susan Swift
Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee
Joel Ventresca
Supervisor Nancy Walker
W.A.P.A.C.
Karen Werner
Rev. Cecil Williams
Lawrence Wong
Michael Wong
Caran Wyland

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

PG&E claims its San Francisco properties are worth more than $1 billion. The State Board of Equalization values PG&E's electric facilities at only about $200 million. Which figure is right? Proposition K asks that this question and others like it be answered by a thorough, impartial study.

There is credible evidence that public ownership of the electric utility would benefit San Franciscans. At the same time, the supply of electricity is a technical and at times confusing issue. If you are confused, remember — the purpose of the study is to end the confusion. We can only make a rational decision when we have the facts.

Support the study. Vote YES on K.

Esmond Coleman, CPA
Eugene Coyle, Ph.D.
Economist
Douglas Dowd, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
John Hardesty, Ph.D.
Economist
Michael Kieschnick, Ph.D.
Economist

Richard Liebes, Ph.D.
Economist
Marc Lumer, CPA
J.B. Neillands, Ph.D.
Professor
Mark Northcross
Fiscal and Energy Consultant
Lee Schultz, CPA
Dick Van Aggelen, CPA

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION K

Cut your utility bills. Vote "YES"!!!

BART Board Candidate Bob Geary

(ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "K"

Oh brother. If you think PG&E is inefficient, wait 'til you see what happens when you turn the task over to City Hall. Nip this one in the bud. Vote no.

Darrell J. Salomon
Civil Service Commissioner

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is the first step in an attempt to force the City and County of San Francisco to buy and operate its own electric utility system. It is undoubtedly in large part a reflection of dissatisfaction with increasing gas and electric rates. It is also an idea born from the notion that in this day and age, the City and County of San Francisco could buy all of the plants and equipment of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company necessary for City Hall to operate an electric utility system.

I am convinced it would not work. The cost of the consultants the City would have to hire to conduct a study of the feasibility of what is called "municipalization" of P.G. & E.'s utility system is estimated by the Controller as $500,000 to $700,000. If you ask me, the actual expense would be more.

Then the City would be mandated to throw good money after bad because, regardless of the findings of the feasibility study, Proposition K requires another election — on "municipalization" and the issuance of bonds. The cost of buying the P.G. & E. plant and equipment could be over $1,000,000,000. According to our Controller, it could, in fact, exceed $1,400,000,000. Additionally, we'd have to pay interest on bonds of at least $100,000,000. Furthermore we'd be paying approximately $35,000,000 a year for salaries, supplies and replacement equipment. Could we afford it? We can't. We might have been able to do so back in the 1930's, before inflation and the P.G. & E. system increased so tremendously, but San Francisco voters rejected the notion 11 times in the period between 1927 and 1941.

VOTE NO ON "K"

I abhor the spectacle of increasing gas and electric rates. That's why I successfully authored the ordinance to eliminate the city's utility tax on the lifeline segment of your gas and electricity bill. However, this is an imprudent and unworkable approach. It's a billion dollar mistake waiting to happen. Passage of it could result in more taxes, less reliable electric service to consumers and even reduced City services in other areas. I intend to vote against Proposition K. I urge you to do the same.

Quentin L. Kopp

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION K. It is a waste of your money. Prop. K would require that we spend a considerable sum of your hard earned dollars — no one yet knows how many — on a “feasibility” study to tell us something we already know and have known for years.

What we are asked to “study” is whether the taxpayers ought to purchase P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities so that these become a part of the City’s bureaucracy and then later to convert them to “consumer ownership.”

Consideration of buying out P.G.&E. in San Francisco has been before the Board of Supervisors in 1971, in 1974 and again in 1979. Each time the Board has turned down further consideration of the plan. Bond issues for this purpose have been placed before the people at least eight times prior to 1942, in days when it might have been economically realistic. Each time the voters rejected the proposal.

This “feasibility” study will tell us what we already know, that it will take a bond issue of many hundreds of millions of dollars to buy out P.G.&E.’s San Francisco facilities. For all that, it would provide no guarantee that the rates for San Franciscans would be any less than the rates allowed by the State Public Utilities Commission today since there is little likelihood that a city hall bureaucracy could run a gas and electricity distribution system any more efficiently than the private sector.

The costs of this study would be paid for by fares collected from the riders of the Muni, payments on your water bill and the revenues of the City’s Hetch Hetchy system. We have far better, more important things to do with those dollars than pay for another useless study.

VOTE NO ON PROP. K

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Is the City in such fantastic financial condition we can afford to commit over ONE BILLION DOLLARS of the taxpayer’s money for the acquisition of P.G.&E.’s local electrical distribution facilities? Do you think we need a $700,000 “consultant contract” to tell us (presumably stupid!) taxpayers and consumers the obvious answer to that question? Supervisors Britt, Walker, and Silver, who endorsed this measure, evidently think so!

Would anyone REALLY want a horde of NEW Civil Service employees in full control and management of our electric power distribution system? Doubtless, they would provide the same superb, efficient management skills and “round the clock” courteous, personalized service we have all experienced with the operation of the Municipal Railway, the “economical” construction of “SUPER SEWER”, and the prompt repairs of our pot-holed streets!

Conservationists might well argue that millions of kilowatt hours could be saved! With typical City operation, the lights and power would likely be off half the time! If operated like the Muni, the proposed enterprise would only lose six dollars for every three dollars the City would collect! The taxpayers will cheerfully make up the multi-million dollar losses!

As matters now stand, the P.G.&E. paid over to the City last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Users Taxes</td>
<td>$15,887,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$5,612,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Taxes</td>
<td>$2,436,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$3,170,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAXES PAID OVER TO THE CITY BY PG&amp;E.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,107,028</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of long term contracts with the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts, plus the Airport, The Muni Railway, and several other major power customers, San Francisco has NO EXCESS POWER FOR SALE! Even if we terminated ALL existing profitable power supply contracts, only TWENTY PERCENT of Hetch Hetchy’s output is available for any proposed municipal distribution operation. The City would still have to purchase EIGHTY percent of the entire City’s needs, wholesale from P.G.&E., mark it up, then RETAIL this power to us. Substantially higher electricity costs would be inevitable!

This irresponsible “Municipal Power” foolishness has been overwhelmingly rejected by San Francisco’s voters NINE TIMES in the past! Let’s save $700,000 and make it a TENTH! We strongly urge a NO vote!

W. F. O’Keefe, Sr. President
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

It is vital for San Francisco’s continued economic progress that our City have a reliable, efficient electric utility system. Proposition K threatens our ability to be certain that residential and commercial consumers will have the electricity they need at an affordable price.

Proponents claim that Proposition K will help cut our electric utility bills. They state that because the City will own the utility we can set rates as we wish.

Nothing could be further from the truth!

The fact is that there is no way the City can own and operate an electric utility without a substantial increase in rates over their current levels. The money to pay for the purchase of equipment, legal battles over the acquisition, a staff of 1,200 employees, huge operating costs, administrative expenses and all the other associated costs have to come from somewhere. That "somewhere" is our pockets.

If Proposition K passes, we will have taken a first step toward establishing another municipally operated utility. Not only will we squander hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer monies to pay a consultant for another "feasibility study" but we will have thrown our City’s hard-won fiscal stability into absolute chaos.

Ultimately, the passage of Proposition K will result in less economic growth in San Francisco and less economic opportunity for everyone who lives here. Every working man and woman in our City is concerned about high utility bills. But that doesn’t mean that anyone wants to take an irresponsible step that could result in higher energy costs, raise taxes, cost thousands of jobs, jeopardize a vital “lifeline” service and inevitably reduce our quality of life.

Don’t sacrifice our City’s future on the flawed altar of “municipal ownership.” We urge you to look closely at Proposition K and to vote NO on November 2.

Jack McNally
Business Manager/Financial Secretary
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
Local Union 1245

Stan Smith
Secretary-Treasurer
Building Trades Council AFL-CIO

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K, the proposed municipal takeover of the electric utility serving San Francisco is an all-time loser designed to overspend and waste the taxpayers' money. It is a proposal that has been considered and rejected by the Board of Supervisors and the voters more than nine times in the past. Before you decide on this issue, think about just a few of the costly elements of municipalization. We would pay for:

* Legal fees and costs to decide on the value of the current owner’s property (as much as $15 million).
* Acquisition of the property (at least $1 billion in bonded indebtedness).
* Principal and interest costs over the life of the bonds in excess of $140 million per year.
* At least 1200 new employees (about $35 million a year in salaries).
* A huge new City administrative staff.
* Facilities and equipment for these employees including office buildings, warehouses, trucks, a service center and supplies.

Where would the money for these costly items come from? Unsurprisingly, taxpayers and consumers would pick up the costs — in higher taxes and higher utility rates — and would be left with fewer city services and a municipally operated electric system. At the same time, San Francisco would lose about $5 million a year in taxes and fees now paid by the current utility owner.

In fact, much of the money we would pour into this municipal system would go into the pockets of Wall Street financiers and bondholders across the country — the people who would buy the high interest-bearing bonds the City would be forced to issue to buy and set up a municipal electric system.

It doesn’t require a “feasibility study” that will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to know that Proposition K is a colossal waste of taxpayers’ money and a sure step toward fiscal havoc for San Francisco.

Please vote NO on Proposition K.

Del Dawson
Steve Stratton
Preston Cook
Ruth Kadish
Nanuui Gray
Tom Hsieh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION “K”

15,500 names were submitted as an initiative measure to subject the voters to a proposal to acquire our own electric system. They hope to sway approximately 329,238 registered voters to vote the destiny for 670,000 persons living in San Francisco. They might get away with it if the history of our voting record is maintained.

You get what you don’t vote for. Here is a proposal that could lead to a bonded indebtedness of almost TWO BILLION DOLLARS if it passes. San Francisco does not need the agony of trying to run another municipally owned entity. Need I remind you of the muni railway. We own the water department, airport and Hetch Hetchy and what revenues do we derive from them? We plow back all the surplus (if any) into non-revenue producing departments to keep them afloat.

This is a no, no. Do your civic duty and vote this down once and for all. It has been rejected many times by City Hall. Do it again.

VOTE NO ON PROP. “K”

Marguerite A. Warren
Taxpayer

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

Proposition K is dangerous to the financial health of our City. Beyond the folly of spending good money for another consultant study the City could lose significant revenues and fall deeply into debt. Further, some 1200 employees might be added to the City’s payroll. If the City were to operate the electric distribution system it would have to pay fair market value to purchase utility properties within the City. The price of this purchase, start-up and transition costs, bond covenants and the like have been estimated at over $1 billion. A bond issue in that amount would place an enormous strain on our fiscal health. In addition, the utility’s franchise payments as well as payroll and property taxes amounting to some $4 million per year would be lost to the City. More importantly, a $10 million profit from sale of Hetch Hetchy power to big businesses and to irrigation districts would be lost each year.

After all of this, there is no guarantee that rates would be reduced! And there is no reason to expect continued good service from a City-operated system. Proposition K is a bad idea that could erode the City’s financial stability. Please, vote NO on K!

Supervisor John L. Molinari
Chair, Finance Committee

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION K

When your lights go out would you rather call PG&E or City Hall???

— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri

(Republican Committeeman)

Terrence Faulkner (Republican Committeeman)

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Polls are open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.
PROPOSITION L
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco not to construct access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The federal and state governments have set standards for access to public buildings for disabled persons. Plans are underway to build an access ramp at the Van Ness Avenue entrance of City Hall.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition L would make it city policy not to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you do not want the City to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to be able to build access ramps at either the Polk Street or Van Ness Avenue entrances to City Hall.

Controller’s Statement on “L”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition L:

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and the project abandoned, in my opinion, it could reduce the cost of government by approximately $600,000.

How Prop L Got on Ballot

On August 17, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition L had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Terry Francois, the proponent of the initiative petition, had gathered 12,010 signatures which his group turned in to the Registrar on August 9th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 11,080 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

NOTE

Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Please take special note: If you DON'T want the ramps built, vote YES. If you WANT the ramps built, vote NO.

Terry A. Francois

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

If you agree that, since there is already a Grove Street access ramp, a Van Ness Avenue ramp which could cost over a half million dollars should not be built, vote "Yes" on Proposition "L". Preserve the beauty of our historic city hall. Vote "Yes" on "L".

COMMITTEE FOR A VOTERS RAMP DECISION

Terry A. Francois
Sylvia Brown Jensen
Eleanor Rossi Crabtree
Albert Meakin

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

Vote YES on Proposition L. Halt squandering of taxpayers' money for ANOTHER ramp on City Hall. Preserve San Francisco's world famous architectural gem. Vote YES on L.

PARENTS AND TAXPAYERS, INC.
Maurine Koltugin, President

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

It is unconscionable to spend over $600,000 of the Taxpayer's dollars to pour tons of concrete for a one hundred and thirteen foot long grotesque ramp sloping upward to the elevated Van Ness entrance to City Hall.

The "Can't use the side door" fixation of a few militant activists should not be permitted to DESTROY the beautiful appearance of this jewel of a building. Moreover, an assymetrical Van Ness Avenue ramp, running 113' uphill directly across the front of the Northern half of the building, creates unnecessary unloading and parking problems for the SEVERELY HANDICAPPED!

Logic and common sense dictates that far more convenient "off-street" access, at minimum cost, can be provided at the better protected Grove Street entrance without DESTROYING the magnificence of this world renowned architectural masterpiece!

I strongly urge a YES vote!

Lee S. Dolson,
Member, Board of Supervisors.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

The proposed DEFACEMENT of our magnificent City Hall, an architectural masterpiece, is intolerable!

An unobtrusive, concealed concrete ramp, gently sloping DOWNWARD BELOW GRADE, from Grove Street, meets all Federal Standards for dramatically improved handicapped access at HALF THE COST, including new power operated entrance doors!

Why spend THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND EXTRA TAX DOLLARS on "symbolism" to placate a handful of unreasonable, intractible, "costs be damned" career agitators? Agitators who clamored to spend well over a million dollars to "butcher" the main Polk Street facade! Fortunately, there wasn't enough money available for this wild-eyed proposal.

Easy access for the handicapped? Certainly! Defacement of the building? Unacceptable. Vote YES for far less costly, aesthetically sensible Grove Street handicapped access!

W. F. O'Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L

We urge a YES vote on Proposition L. Construction of ramp and remodeling of Van Ness entrance to City Hall at estimated cost of $600,000 (actual cost probably double) would be wasteful misuse of public funds and cause permanent and inexcusable defacement of the most beautiful of City Halls

_ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION L_

Why wreck historic landmarks???

_Robert Silvestri_
— BART Candidate Robert Silvestri (Republican)

_ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L_

Direct and equal access to City Hall is a fundamental civil right. Proposition “L” denies civil rights to people with disabilities. Ramping a main entrance at City Hall is essential to at least 23% of our residents, who are elderly or disabled.

For seven years architects, preservationists, community residents, fiscal and urban planners designed 10 alternative access designs. A plan emerged with Historic Preservation Council approval which is consistent with cost constraints and enhances the architectural integrity of City Hall through main entrance access. Proposition “L” would prevent implementation of these constructive efforts.

Proposition “L” is an end run around previous decisions, planning, policies, and laws of city, State and Federal governments to keep disabled people from having main entrance access to City Hall.

Vote NO on “L” for Equal Access!

Endorsements for Ballot Arguments Against Proposition L

Board of Directors, San Francisco Independent Living Project
Rev. Pat Lewis, C.C.S.P. Vicar for the Handicapped, Archdiocese of San Francisco
Judy Forsberg, Bernal Heights Association
Charles Lamb
Eugene Coleman; Canon Kip
Kathi Smith, Disabled Democratic Club
Chelsea Baylor
Arlene Chew Wong, Multiple Sclerosis Society
John King, UCFA
Geraldine Johnson, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Jeff Mori
Lawrence Marcelino

Wil Leong, SF Pretrial Diversion Project
Ralph Hurtado, MALDEF
Susan Brier
Dorothy Joseph
Wilson Chang
Bob Bustamante, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Leach, Mayor’s Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noemi Sohn
Weblia Whitefield
Lucile Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarsfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Paul Goodale
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sobania Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKasse Murphy
Kathleen Lammons, Gray Panthers
Tim Wolfred, Community College Board
Arthur Morris, Theatre Rhinoecros
Dmitri Betser
Pat Christianson
H. David Sokoloff, FAIA, President, Sokoloff/Bennett Associates
Robert Herman, Architect
Philip Burton, Member of Congress
Arnold Lerner, AIA Architect
Hank Wittenburg, Hotel Owner
Supervisor Doris Ward
Supervisor Nancy Walker
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Supervisor John Molinari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Britt
Susan Bierman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Rutberg
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ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will mean that the physically disabled of our city will have equal access to our beautiful City Hall. The carefully designed access walkway located at the Van Ness Avenue entrance to City Hall will be a harmonious addition to this magnificent building. It will be available for use by everyone. Your “NO” vote on Proposition L will assure its timely construction.

The design for the walkway was considered by The Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage, our Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board and Art Commission, the Historic Preservation Officer of the State of California, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, a Federal council. The people who serve these organizations are chosen because of their artistic or architectural interests or experiences. Each one of these agencies agreed that the walkway would not deface City Hall as claimed by the proponents of this proposition.

The City has spent considerable funds in developing the walkway plan. This money, approved by the Board of Supervisors, was used to assure us that the walkway would be a fitting architectural addition to City Hall. I believe we have achieved that objective. Your NO vote on Proposition L will mean that these funds were not spent needlessly.

I have outlined for you the thoughtful process used in reaching our decision on the walkway. We think it was the right one. Your NO vote will make it possible to proceed with the project without further delay and inconvenience to the physically disabled. VOTE “NO” ON PROPOSITION L.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION L

Let Senior Citizens and the Handicapped enter City Hall and participate in Government. Vote “NO”!!!

BART Board Candidate, Bob Geary (Democratic Committeeman)
Arlo Hale Smith
Democratic Committeeman

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

OOPS!

Sometimes we make mistakes but when we do, we admit it:

With all the items that go into this pamphlet, it’s possible we may have missed something or even made a mistake. If we did, we will publish a correction notice in the three local papers just before election day. Watch for our ad:

OCTOBER 30, 31 and NOVEMBER 1

S.F. Chronicle, Examiner & Progress

(Look under “Official Advertising” or “Legal Notices”)
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PROPOSITION M
Shall it be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to make zoning changes to permit the construction of a private hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and U.C. Medical Center and specifying the property for its location?

Analysis
By Ballot Simplification Committee

THE WAY IT IS NOW: The parcels of land in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center listed in this initiative are now zoned for residential use.

THE PROPOSAL: Proposition M is a Declaration of Policy that asks the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center. The proposed hotel would have 200-225 bedrooms, a restaurant, cocktail lounge, gift shop and banking facilities. Thirty housing units would be built for sale or rental. At least 135 parking spaces would be provided.

A YES VOTE MEANS: If you vote yes, you want to ask the City to change the zoning from residential to commercial where necessary to permit the private construction of a hotel in the area of the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Medical Center.

A NO VOTE MEANS: If you vote no, you want the City to continue to zone the area under the present laws.

Controller’s Statement on “M”

City Controller John C. Farrell has issued the following statement on the fiscal impact of Proposition M:

Should the proposed Declaration of Policy be approved and implemented, in my opinion, some increases in Real Property, Hotel Tax and other revenues may occur.

NOTE
Your precinct location may be different than at previous elections. Please refer to the location of your polling place on the back cover.

How Prop M Got on Ballot

On August 18, Registrar of Voters Jay Patterson certified that the initiative petition designated as Proposition M had a sufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Robert Guichard, the proponent of the initiative petition had gathered 16,971 signatures, which he turned in to the Registrar on August 13th.

A random check of the signatures showed that 12,220 of the signatures were valid. This is more than the 9,679 signatures needed to qualify an initiative declaration of policy for the ballot.

THE FULL LEGAL TEXT OF PROP M BEGINS ON PAGE 100.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO LABOR MOVEMENT VOTING YES ON THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the undersigned, are active members of the labor movement in San Francisco, and as such, are greatly concerned over the current high unemployment in San Francisco, as well as the soaring cost of health care.

The unemployment level in the building trades unions in San Francisco is 25% where it was only 3% one year ago. Moreover, there is no end in sight to the slowdown in construction, and thus every effort must be made to encourage quality development.

The health care cost for our members is soaring, becoming an ever increasing problem to provide the continued high level of quality care which we are able to currently provide.

Because of our concerns for providing jobs for those now unemployed, for lowering health care cost without a reduction in health care quality, for providing lodging for family members for hospitalized patients, and above all, for encouragement to those interested in quality and innovative growth, we urge you to support the medically oriented lodging facility by voting YES on Proposition M.

Jack Goldberger, Labor Consultant
Charles Lamb, President, Hotel Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union Local 2
Stanley Smith, Secretary-Treasurer
San Francisco Building Trades Council
Lawrence Mazzola, President
San Francisco Building Trades Council
John Lappin, International Officer
I.B.E.W.
Robert Morales, Secretary-Treasurer
Teamsters Local 350
Betsy Blom, Business Representative
Dept. Store Employees # 1100
James Ballard, President
AFT Local 61
Madelyn Sanarzez, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Handeman, Business Representative
Sign and Display Local 510
Patricia Jackson, President
SEIU Local 400

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

NEIGHBORS SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

VOTE YES ON M

We, the residents and neighbors living in close proximity to this proposed medically oriented recuperation and lodging facility, welcome and enthusiastically support the development of this project.

The building of this facility as proposed in this initiative will not only add to the beauty and quality of our neighborhood, but increase the opportunity for our children and neighbors to find jobs close to home.

Specifically, we support this project for the additional following reasons:

1. This medical lodging facility is ideally situated to act as a buffer zone between the University of California Complex and the closed and dilapidated Polytechnic High School, thereby, upgrading the neighborhood.

2. This project is sensitively designed and architecturally attractive and compatible to existing structures, adding to the aesthetics of our community.

3. Construction of this facility with its added parking space will reduce traffic congestion in the area.

4. The medical lodging facility will also include 30 housing units replacing the current 11 houses; thus, adding to San Francisco’s housing stock and tax base.

5. The proposed use of this project’s site is no different than the current use; thus, the character of the immediate neighborhood will not be changed.

If you believe in the merits of this project as we do, then please join us and help us by voting Yes on M.

John Clark
Michael Tuggle
J. E. O’Guin
Patrick Conley
Dorothy Campbell
Helen O’Connell

William Segatis
David Finn
Sylvia Durrance
Lyle Conley
Wilfred Willis
June Sanchez
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

PHYSICIANS AT THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL CENTER
SUPPORT THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
AND LODGING FACILITY:

VOTE YES ON M.

We, the undersigned physicians and surgeons who practice in the immediate area, wish to go on record in support of the medically oriented lodging facility.

We know from first hand knowledge that this facility is badly needed to benefit patients and relatives of patients who come to the Parnassus Heights Medical Complex and the University of California Hospital Complex. There are no facilities of this type now available for use by these sick patients and their friends or relatives. The proper use of this facility will not only decrease medical care costs, but will add substantial revenue to the city and will provide many needed jobs.

We urge you to vote Yes on M.

Robert Allen, Jr., M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery
E. Trent Andrews, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Ernest Bates, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Neurosurgery
Crowell Beard, M. D.  
Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Andreas Blum, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

William Breall, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine
Devon Char, M. D.  
Associate Professor of Ophthalmology
Reuben Clay, Jr., M. D.  
Assistant Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Marcus Conant, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Herbert Deto, M. D.  
Professor of Otolaryngology
Vice Chairman, Department of Otolaryngology
Alfred de Lorimier, M. D.  
Professor of Surgery, Chairman of Pediatric Surgery
William Ehrenfeld, M. D.  
Professor of Surgery
Paul Fitzgerald, M. D.  
Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine and of Metabolic Research
Alexander Hirschfeld, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry
Jay Kaiser, M. D.  
Assistant Clinical Professor of Radiology
Malcolm Powell, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Radiology and of Medicine
Howard Shapiro, M. D.  
Samuel Siegman, M. D.  
Associate Clinical Professor of Dermatology
John Sullivan, M. D.  
Assistant Clinical Professor of Ophthalmology
Theodore Tromovitch, M. D.  
Clinical Professor of Dermatology
Edwin Wylde, M. D.  
Professor of Surgery, Vice Chairman Department of Surgery

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED
HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY.

VOTE YES ON M

This privately owned, medically oriented project will NOT be an additional burden on San Francisco’s taxpayers! Just the opposite! Hundreds of thousands of dollars of NEW tax revenues will paid TO THE CITY, each year, forever!

It will substantially reduce TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZED medical costs by getting recovering patients out of $358.00 a day hospital rooms (Intermediate Care is $786.00 and Intensive Care is $1,116.00 a day!), and into relatively low cost accommodations ACROSS THE STREET from the U. C. Medical Center.

Further, compassion dictates that sleeping facilities, CLOSE AT HAND, be available for the relatives of seriously ill and dying patients. We recommend a YES vote on M!

W. F. O’Keeffe, Sr. President.
SAN FRANCISCO TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

CONCERNED CITIZENS VOTING YES ON M, THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL AND LODGING FACILITY

San Francisco is known throughout the world as a city of new ideas. A city where innovation and creativity have become a hallmark.

In keeping with these traditions, San Franciscans are being asked to consider the exciting new designs for a recuperation and medically oriented lodging facility to be located adjacent to the University of California Medical Center.

The proposed lodging facility will significantly reduce the cost of health care by allowing patients who are being treated at the University of California Medical Center to be treated as an out-patient or discharged earlier and housed in this medically oriented lodge at a fraction of the cost.

Moreover, this facility would also provide lodging for the relatives of patients who want to be close to their loved ones during their time of need, rather than having to commute from a location many miles away.

Other aspects of this project are equally exciting and certainly contribute to the prosperity of San Francisco. The added parking provided by the Lodge will reduce traffic congestion around the U.C. Medical Center; the additional 30 housing units to be built will add to San Francisco's housing stock; the increased tax revenue; and the creation of numerous jobs at a time when unemployment is critically high are all good reasons in and of themselves to support this project, not to mention the additional consideration of its humanitarian services.

We feel proud and honored to be part of this innovation to improve and economize health care delivery systems. We encourage San Franciscans to lead the rest of the country by approving the completion of this project by voting YES on Proposition M.

George Chinn
Guy Cherny
Ted Soulis
Gene Prat
William Conroy
Ernest McNabb

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION M

SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD SUPPORTS THE MEDICALLY ORIENTED HOTEL
VOTE YES ON M

As President of S.H.A.R.P., the largest and oldest neighborhood organization in the Sunset District and upper Sunset Heights, representing over 1400 people, and in close proximity to the proposed Medically Oriented Lodge, I enthusiastically support this project. The merits of this project are numerous. This project is innovative, futuristic and unquestionably needed. It will provide lodging for visiting relatives of patients which is undeniably needed. It will reduce health care costs by allowing many people to stay in a medical lodging type facility after surgery or awaiting test results etc., rather than a hospital. Severe hardships, of which I have personally witnessed, could be minimized or hopefully eliminated. The traffic congestion will be reduced because of the added parking and elimination of the current to and fro transportation of these people who are currently staying in high priced hotels in other areas of San Francisco.

Since the project is privately financed and constructed, it will add greatly to San Francisco's tax base and provide much needed jobs for residents of the neighborhood. Moreover, the project is beautifully designed and will upgrade the neighborhood, acting, as an excellent buffer between the residential houses and the Parnassus Heights Medical Building, the U.C. garage and the abandoned Polytechnic High School, all of which form its boundaries.

Join me and other members of S.H.A.R.P., in supporting this much needed medical facility. Vote Yes on M.

George Morris, President, S.H.A.R.P.
Sunset Heights Association of Responsible People
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I urge all of our citizens who are interested in protecting our neighborhood zoning procedures to vote "NO" on Proposition "M." Your "NO" vote will assure that you will continue to have a voice before the City Planning Commission regarding any zoning changes in your neighborhood.

Proposition "M" is supported by a group of developers who wish to profit from the construction of a hotel and related commercial uses in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood near the University of California Medical Center. Their project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission at a public hearing. Because these developers did not get their way before the Commission, they placed this proposition on the ballot by petition. You made your voices heard at City Hall before the City Planning Commission in opposition to the hotel project. I urge you to once again make your voices heard by voting "NO" on Proposition "M."

When the hotel project was disapproved by the City Planning Commission, the sponsors appealed that decision to the Board of Supervisors. They withdrew their appeal before the Board of Supervisors could act on it. Why? I can only assume that they did not have the votes on the Board of Supervisors to override the disapproval by the City Planning Commission. They are now appealing to you, the voters of this city, to grant them a privilege which was denied to them by the City Planning Commission.

Proposition "M" is not good for neighborhood zoning or planning. A "NO" vote on Proposition "M" will safeguard our neighborhoods and reaffirm the public hearing process as provided by the City Charter.

Dianne Feinstein
Mayor

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Proposition M is a self-serving, special interest proposition. The City Planning Commission rejected a hotel project here three years ago. It believed that the project was too big for the neighborhood and that the project would cause traffic congestion and the removal of inexpensive housing.

Proposition M is a precedent-setting circumvention of public review procedures and neighborhood participation in zoning decisions. Zoning by petition is bad for the city and bad for residents most affected by proposed changes.

Vote No on Proposition M to protect the Charter's public hearing process and to keep your voice alive in neighborhood zoning. VOTE "NO" ON M

Submitted by:
City Planning Commission

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Former Member of the Board of Supervisors, John Burdis Urges You to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

I strongly urge all San Franciscans to VOTE NO on Proposition M.

VOTE NO to stop developers from by-passing the Board of Supervisors and City Planning Commission.

VOTE NO to save scarce affordable housing from demolition.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO to prevent developers from destroying a family residential neighborhood.

VOTE NO to uphold the residential zoning laws protecting your neighborhood and all residential districts in our city.

John Burdis
Former Member of the Board of Supervisors

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Member of the University of California Board of Regents Says Vote No on Proposition M

I encourage all San Franciscans to vote No on Proposition M. Both the neighborhoods and the University of California, San Francisco oppose this unwarranted and unneeded commercialization of the residential neighborhood which surrounds the San Francisco campus.

Yori Wada
Member, Board of Regents
University of California

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION M. Proposition M, if passed, will set a precedent which will endanger every neighborhood in the City.

PROPOSITION M IS A DEVIous TACTIC. In 1978 the owner of some 16 parcels of residentially zoned and used land in the Parnassus Heights neighborhood attempted to build a commercial hotel complex two blocks from Golden Gate Park. People were evicted from their homes and plans were made to demolish 52 housing units on the site. After a series of hearings both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors rejected the project. Now, the developer is attempting to reverse the previous decision without any new public hearings.

PROPOSITION M IS A SELF-INTERESTED COMMERCIAL PROJECT, NOT MEDICALLY ORIENTED. Read the policy statement in full. You will see that this is a straightforward commercial project. No mention is made in the text of the measure to a supposed “medically oriented” use of the commercial hotel.

PROPOSITION M IS BROADLY OPPOSED. No one wants a commercial hotel, cocktail lounge, gift shop, banking facility, parking garage, and other “ancillary commercial areas” in the midst of this residential neighborhood: not the neighbors, not the City and not U.C. Medical Center.

PROPOSITION M IS BAD FOR YOU. Vote “NO” on this special interest spot rezoning. Vote “NO” on this proposition and save your neighborhood, your street and your home from being the victim of some future such measure.

Douglas J. Engmann

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Nearby Neighborhood Organizations endorse the above argument against Proposition M.

EDGECWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
FOREST KNOLLS NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION
FRANCISCO HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
GOLDEN GATE HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
HAIGHT-ASHBURY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
INNER SUNSET ACTION COMMITTEE
INNER SUNSET NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITTEE
MOUNT SUTRO DEFENSE COMMITTEE
SPEAK
STANYAN-FULTON STREET NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
SUNSET NEIGHBORS UNITED
TWIN PEAKS COUNCIL
WOODLAND AVENUE ASSOCIATION

San Francisco Civic Associations
SAN FRANCISCO BLACK POLITICAL CAUCUS
BEIDEMAN AREA NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP
COALITION FOR SAN FRANCISCO NEIGHBORHOODS
CONSUMER ACTION
DUBOCE TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
EAST MISSION IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
EUREKA VALLEY PROMOTION ASSOCIATION
LA RAZA EN ACCION LOCAL
NOB HILL NEIGHBORS
PACIFIC HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
PACIFIC HEIGHTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
RICHMOND ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION
SAN FRANCISCAN DEMOCRATIC CLUB
SAN FRANCISCO TOMORROW

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Although more low cost, fair priced rooming accommodations are needed for out-of-town patients (and their families) undergoing diagnosis and treatment at UCSF, there is no need for a luxury highrise hotel. A luxury highrise hotel would commercialize a legally zoned residential neighborhood and further increase traffic congestion in the area. This is a devious and exploitative initiative. Its submission as a citywide ballot issue is an attempt to circumvent strong neighborhood objections and the considered judgments of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. A luxury hotel would not be affordable by the vast majority of the out-of-town patients who seek medical care at UCSF.

Nicholas L. Petrakis, M.D.
Chairman, Dept. Epidemiology & International Health

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhood urges a No vote. It allows destruction of moderate cost housing to build a hotel. This proposal mis-uses the initiative process. We urge you to vote NO.

N. Arden Danekas
Chairman, Housing Committee
Jonathan D. Bulkley
President

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.
ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

As Chancellor Emeritus, a member of the faculty of the University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley for 48 years, and a 45 year resident of the neighborhood where Dr. Rider's Hotel is proposed, it is my observation that this commercial hotel will not meet the needs of out-of-town patients and their families who come to UCSF for care. First, there is a definite need for some sort of low cost accommodation for these patients and their families, who come to UCSF from northern and central California and from all over the country for special diagnosis and treatment afforded by this tertiary medical center. But commercial hotel rates are too high for most of these people.

Second, my understanding is that this hotel would provide only 135 parking spaces for 200 to 225 bedrooms. The parking ratio is far too low in view of the fact that parking is needed not only for the patient and his or her family but for other visitors. The area's major problem is parking. This would greatly worsen the traffic and parking problems in this already congested area. Third, this is a residential neighborhood, and a commercial hotel does not belong on this site.

John B. de C. M. Saunders, M.D.
Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus
University of California, San Francisco

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

The private developer behind this measure previously asked the City for a big up-zoning of his property to permit building a large hotel in an area zoned for residential use. He was emphatically turned down by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Now he is asking you, the voters, to ask the City to change its policy for his benefit at the expense of others living in the area. His hotel and its bar, restaurant, convention facilities and inadequate parking seem less likely to serve patients and their relatives than conventioners and tourists. The facts are: The area is already seriously over-congested, with unsolved traffic and parking problems. The adjacent University of California has agreed to limit its own growth. The need is for quiet, reasonably priced accommodations. This proposition asks for spot rezoning that would circumvent the City Master Plan and set a dangerous precedent that would be followed by developers in other residential areas.

The above ballot argument is endorsed by the following medical doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Mile Cucek
Dr. Mary Dallman
Dr. Peter Dallman
Norma Dennes
Dr. Richard Dennes
Dr. Roberta Fenlon
Jean Ferdinandsen
Nan Freitas
Ann Gilliam
Harold Gilliam
Dr. Sadja Greenwood
Richard Harrington
Granger Hill
Ellen Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lalanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Matthew LaVail
Margaret Northcott
Kenny O'Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salan
Dr. Donald Sandner
Mary Sandner
Dr. Alan Skolnikoff
Suzanne Skolnikoff

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

I am an inner Sunset resident and a Professor at UCSF. I urge a no vote on Proposition M. My observation as a doctor seeing patients is that low-cost transient accommodations are important. There is already under renovation nearby, on Stanyan Street, a hotel facility in a commercial zone. UCSF and the surrounding residential neighborhood do not need a high-cost commercial business venture requiring special legislation.

Alan J. Margolis, M.D.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION M

Don't let multimillionaire-speculator Dr. Rider ruin Golden Gate Park's skyline. Vote "NO"!!!
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION A

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

3.530 Police Department

The police department shall consist of a police commission, a chief of police, a police force, an office of citizen complaints 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 five members who shall be appointed by the mayor, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of twelve hundred dollars ($1200). The term of each commissioner shall be four years, commencing at 12:00 o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1945, 1946 and 1948 respectively, and two terms commencing on the 15th day of January in the year 1976. The incumbents serving as members of the commission on the effective date of this amendment, increasing the membership of the commission, 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. Not less than one member of said commission shall be a woman.

The police commissioners shall be the successors in office of the police commissioners holding office in the city and county on January 3, 1972, and shall have all the powers and duties thereof, except as otherwise in this charter provided. They shall have the power 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 who 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 section 8.405 of this charter; provided, however, nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with the provisions of section 8.405 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.

All positions in the police department legally authorized shall be continued, and incumbents therein legally appointed thereto shall be continued as officers and employees of the department under the conditions governing their respective appointments and except as otherwise provided in this charter.

3.530-2 Office of Citizen Complaints

The police commission shall have the power and duty to appoint a director of the office of citizen complaints who shall hold office at its pleasure. The appointment shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. The director shall never have been a uniformed member or employee of the department. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall be the appointing officer under the civil service provisions of this charter for the appointment, removal or discipline of employees of the office of citizen complaints.

The police commission shall have the power and duty to organize, reorganize, and manage the office of citizen complaints. Subject to the civil service provisions of this charter, the office of citizen complaints shall include investigators and hearing officers. No full-time or part-time employee of the office of citizen complaints shall have previously served as a uniformed member of the department. Subject to rule of the police commission, the director of the office of citizen complaints may appoint part-time hearing officers who shall be exempt from the civil service requirements of this charter. Compensation of said hearing officers shall be at rates recommended by the police commission and established by the board of supervisors or contract approved by the board of supervisors.

Complaints of police misconduct or allegations that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty shall be promptly, fairly, and impartially investigated by staff of the office of citizen complaints. The office of citizen complaints shall investigate all complaints of police misconduct or that a member of the police department has not properly performed a duty, except those complaints which on their face clearly indicate that the acts complained of were proper and those complaints lodged by other members of the police department. The office of citizen complaints shall recommend disciplinary action to the chief of police on those complaints that are sustained. The director of the office of citizen complaints shall schedule hearings before hearing officers when such is requested by the complainant or member of the department and, in accordance with rules of the commission, such a hearing will facilitate the fact-finding process.
(Proposition A, Continued)

Nothing herein shall prohibit the chief of police or a commanding officer from investigating the conduct of a member of the department under his or her command, or taking disciplinary or corrective action, otherwise permitted by this charter, when such is warranted; and nothing herein shall limit or otherwise restrict the disciplinary powers vested in the chief of police and the police commission by other provisions of this charter.

The office of citizen complaints shall prepare in accordance with rules of the police commission monthly summaries of the complaints received and shall prepare recommendations quarterly concerning policies or practices of the department which could be changed or amended to avoid unnecessary tension with the public or a definable segment of the public while insuring effective police services.

In carrying out its objectives the office of citizen complaints shall receive prompt and full cooperation and assistance from all departments, officers, and employees of the city and county. The director of the office of citizen complaints may also suggest and the chief of police shall require the testimony or attendance of any member of the police department to carry out the responsibilities of the office of citizen complaints.

The annual appropriations for all costs of the office of citizen complaints shall not exceed sixty percent of the costs incurred by the police department internal affairs bureau for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1981, adjusted annually therefore for inflation. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION B

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold face; deletions are indicated by ((double parenthesis)).

6.205 Powers and Duties of the Board of Supervisors

On or before June 30th of each year the board of supervisors shall, except for equipment and capital improvements, enact an interim appropriation ordinance and an annual salary ordinance in accordance with a procedure set forth by ordinance, provided, however, that the interim appropriation ordinance and annual salary ordinance so enacted shall reflect the rates of compensation established by section 8.401 of this charter, and not later than August 25th of each year shall amend said ordinances pursuant to sections 8.404 and 8.405 of this charter.

The board of supervisors shall fix the date or dates, not less than ten days after receipt from the mayor, for consideration of and public hearings on the proposed budget and proposed appropriation ordinance. The Board of Supervisors may, by a two-thirds vote of all members thereof, shorten, extend or otherwise modify the time fixed in this section or in sections 6.200, 6.202, 6.203 or 6.206 of this charter for the performance of any act by any officer, board or commission.

The board of supervisors may decrease or reject any item contained in the proposed budget, and may without reference or amendment to the detail schedule of positions and compensations, decrease any total amount for personal services 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 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.

In the event the public utilities commission and the mayor shall propose a budget for any utility which will exceed the estimated revenue of such utility, it shall require a vote of two-thirds of all members of the board of supervisors to approve such budget estimate and to appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the deficiency.

Such budget of expenditures in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for the acquisition of Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles. Proposed expenditures for other additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs shall ((in amount not to)) not exceed three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, other than for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to three-quarters of one cent ($0.0075) on each hundred dollars ($100) valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county provided further that proposed expenditures, for additions, betterments, extensions of other capital costs in excess thereof, except for Municipal Railway revenue vehicles and related structures, facilities, machinery and other equipment reasonably necessary for upkeep and maintenance of said vehicles, shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.407(a) of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.

After public hearing, and not earlier than the 15th day of July, nor later than the first of August of each year the board of supervisors shall adopt the proposed budget as submitted or as amended and shall adopt the annual appropriation ordinance accordingly, which
(Proposition B, Continued)
shall supersede the interim appropriation ordinance.

6.407 Utility Revenues and Expenditures

(a) Receipts from each utility operated by the public utilities commission shall be paid into the city and county treasury and maintained in a separate fund for each utility. Appropriations from such funds shall be made for the following purposes for each such utility in the order named, viz: (1) for the payment of operating expenses, pension charges, and proportionate payments to such compensation and other insurance and accident reserve funds as the commission may establish or the board of supervisors may require; (2) for repairs and maintenance; (3) for reconstruction and replacements as hereinafter described: (4) for the payment of interest and sinking funds on the bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extensions: (5) for extensions and improvements, and (6) for a surplus fund. The board of supervisors shall transfer to the general fund each year an amount equal to the annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on general obligation bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility under the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission.

(b) The salaries and general expenses of the commission or bureaus thereof not chargeable to a specific department shall be apportioned fairly among the departments under the control of the public utilities commission in such manner as the commission may deem appropriate, and such apportionment shall be shown as expenses of such department.

(c) For the purpose of computing net income, the public utilities commission, on the basis of an appraisal of the estimated life and the then current depreciated value of the several classes of property in each utility, shall determine the amount of reasonable annual depreciation for each utility. During the fiscal year 1937-1938 and at least every five years thereafter, the commission shall make an appraisal or may revise the last preceding appraisal of the value and probable useful life of each of the several classes of property of each utility, and shall, on the basis of said appraisal, redetermine the amount of the reasonable annual depreciation for each utility.

(d) For the purpose of providing funds for reconstruction and replacements due to physical and functional depreciation of each of the utilities under the jurisdiction of the commission, the commission must create and maintain a reconstruction and replacement fund for each such utility, sufficient for the purposes mentioned in this section, and in accordance with an established practice for utilities of similar character, which shall be the basis for the amount necessary to be appropriated annually to provide for said reconstruction and replacements.

(e) If any accumulation in the surplus fund of any utility shall, in any fiscal year, exceed 25 percent of the total expenditures of such utility for operation, repairs and maintenance for the preceding fiscal year, such excess may be transferred by the board of supervisors to the general fund of the city and county, and shall be deposited by the commission with the treasurer to the credit of such general fund.

(f) Any budget of expenditures for any public utility in excess of estimated revenues may be approved to provide for and include proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs, in amount not to exceed $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, provided that whenever tax support is required for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs the total provision for such purposes shall not exceed an amount equivalent to $.0075 on each $100 valuation of property subject to taxation by the city and county and provided further than proposed expenditures for additions, betterments, extensions or other capital costs in excess thereof shall require financing by authorization and sale of bonds. This section shall have precedence over section 6.205 of this charter and any other section deemed in conflict herewith.) (End)
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7.311 Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness for financing the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities.

(a) The board of supervisors may, by resolution, from time to time authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness to assist private parties in the financing or refinancing of the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of facilities suitable for industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy uses or other facilities and activities incidental to such industrial, manufacturing, research and development, commercial and energy facilities or for the purpose of refunding such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall be issued to procedures adopted by ordinance of the board of supervisors. The repayment of principal, interest and other charges on such financial assistance by the private parties receiving such assistance shall be the sole source of monies pledged for repayment of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness. Bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness issues under the provisions of this section shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the City and County of San Francisco or a pledge of the faith and credit of the City and County of San Francisco, but shall be payable solely from funds specified in this section. The issuance of such bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness shall not directly, indirectly, or contingently obligate the board of supervisors to levy or to pledge any form of taxation whatever or to make any appropriation for their payment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the authority of the board of supervisors to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under any other applicable provision of this Charter or any other applicable provisions of the general laws of the State of California.

(c) All legislation necessary for the issuance of bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness under this section shall not be subject to the voter approval requirement of section 7.300.
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8.428 Health Service System Fund

There is hereby created a health service system fund. The costs of the health service system shall be borne by the members of the system and retired persons, the City and County of San Francisco because of its members and retired persons and because of the members and retired persons of the Parking Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, the San Francisco Unified School District because of its members and retired persons and the San Francisco Community College District because of its members and retired persons. A retired person as used in this section means a former member of the health service system retired under the San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System((C)), and the surviving spouse of an active employee and the surviving spouse of a retired employee, provided that the surviving spouse and the active or retired employee have been married for a period of at least one year prior to the death of the active or retired employee.

The City and County, the school district and the community college district shall each contribute to the health service fund amounts sufficient for the following purpose, and subject to the following limitations:

(a) All funds necessary to efficiently administer the health service system.

(b) For the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute to the health service system fund with respect to each of their members an amount equal to one-half of "the average contribution," as certified by the health service board in accordance with the provisions of Section 8.423.

(c) Monthly contributions required from retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons participating in the system shall be equal to the monthly contributions required from members in the system, except that the total contributions required from retired persons who are also covered under Medicare shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount contributed monthly by such persons to Medicare; provided, however, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the city and county, the school district and the community college district shall contribute funds sufficient to defray the difference in cost to the system in providing the same health coverage to retired persons and the surviving spouses of active employees and retired persons as is provided for active employee members.

(d) The City and County, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District shall not contribute to the health service fund any sums, except as hereinbefore set forth, on account of participation in the benefits of the system by members' dependents except surviving spouses, retired persons' dependents except surviving spouses, persons who retired and elected not to receive benefits from San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System and resigned employees and teachers defined in Section 8.425, and any employee whose compensation is fixed in accordance with Sections 8.401, 8.403, or 8.404 of this charter and whose compensation therein includes an additional amount for health and welfare benefits or whose health service costs are reimbursed through any fund established for said purpose by ordinance of the board of supervisors.

It shall be the duty of the board of supervisors, the board of education and the governing board of the community college district annually to appropriate to the health service system fund such amounts as are necessary to cover the respective obligations of the city and county, the San Francisco Unified School District and the San Francisco Community College District hereby imposed. Contributions to the health service system fund of the city and county, of the school district and of the fund or the school, utility, bond or other special fund concerned.

The amendments of this section contained in the proposition therefore submitted to the electorate on November 7, 1972, shall be effective July 1, 1973.

If in the election of November 2, 1982 two or more propositions amending Section 8.428 of this charter receive the number of votes necessary for their adoption, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, the city attorney shall incorporate their provisions into one section. (End)
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8.514-1 Surviving Spouse Retirement Benefits

Notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, except sections 8.559-14 and 8.585-14, or local ordinance terminating a retirement benefit upon remarriage to the contrary, any retirement allowance payable to the surviving spouse of a member shall not be terminated upon the remarriage of said surviving spouse, provided that such remarriage occurs on or after said surviving spouse attains the age of 60 years, and further provided that the provisions of this section shall be applicable only to the first such marriage.

Any allowance heretofore terminated by reason of the remarriage of a surviving spouse shall be reinstated in the amount which had been terminated and shall be payable hereafter to said surviving spouse, subject to the provisions of the first paragraph herein.

Neither the preceding paragraph nor this section in its entirety shall give a surviving spouse, or the successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any retirement allowance payable for time prior to the effective date of this section.

The terms of this section shall not apply to a surviving spouse who remarries either an active or retired member of the retirement system. (End)
the average number of days ordinarily worked by persons in the same grade or class of positions as the positions held by him during such period and at the rate of pay attached to such positions, it being assumed that during any absence he was in the position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to entering city-service he was in the position first held by him in city-service.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," and "death benefit."

"Average final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earned by a member during any five consecutive years of credited service in the retirement system in which his average final compensation is the highest, unless the board of supervisors shall otherwise provide by ordinance enacted by three-fourths vote of all members of the board.

For the purposes of the retirement system and of this section, the terms "miscellaneous officer or employee," or "member," as used in this section shall mean any officer or employee who is not a member of the fire or police departments as defined in the charter for the purpose of the retirement system, under section 8.507 of the charter.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and County Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of the charter.

"Charter" shall mean the charter of the City and County of San Francisco.

Words used in the masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter genders, and singular numbers shall include the plural and the plural the singular.

"Interest" shall mean interest at the rate adopted by the retirement board.

(B) Any member who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system and attains the age of fifty years, or at least ten years of service in the aggregate credited in the retirement system, and attains the age of sixty years of 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 service retirement allowance at the rate of 2 per cent of said average final compensation for each year of service; provided, however, that upon the compulsory retirement of a member upon his attainment of the age of sixty-five years, if the allowance available to such member pursuant to the provisions of subsection (F) 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 said 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 years, computed under subsection (G), shall be an allowance equal to the percentage of said average final compensation set forth opposite his age at retirement, taken to the preceding completed quarter year, for each year of service, computed under subsection (G):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Retirement</th>
<th>Percent for Each Year of Credited Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50½</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50¾</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51½</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51¾</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¼</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52½</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52¾</td>
<td>1.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¼</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53½</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53¾</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¼</td>
<td>1.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54½</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54¾</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¼</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55½</td>
<td>1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55¾</td>
<td>1.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¼</td>
<td>1.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56½</td>
<td>1.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56¾</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¼</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57½</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57¾</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¼</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58½</td>
<td>1.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58¾</td>
<td>1.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¼</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59½</td>
<td>1.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59¾</td>
<td>1.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In no event shall a member's retirement allowance exceed seventy-five percent of his average final compensation.

Before the first payment of a retirement allowance is made, a member retired under this subsection or subsection (C) 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 to
(Proposition H, Continued) 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 8514 of the charter, the portion of service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contributions shall be not 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 within fifteen years or more of service at the compulsory retirement age of sixty-five, the portion of the service retirement allowance provided by the city and county's contribution shall be such that the total retirement allowance shall not be less than $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 eight-tenths percent 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 forty percent of his average final compensation; otherwise one and eight-tenths percent of his average final compensation multiplied by the number of years of city-service which would be credited to him were such city-service to continue until attainment by him of age sixty, but such retirement allowance shall not exceed forty percent of such average final compensation. In the calculation under this subsection of the retirement allowance of a member having credit for service in a position in the evening schools and service in any other position, separate retirement 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 one (1) year immediately preceding his retirement. Part time service and compensation shall be reduced to full time service and compensation in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors, and when so reduced shall be applied as full time service and compensation in the calculation of retirement allowances.

The question of retiring a member under this subsection may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of any commission or board, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement.

(D) 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 benefit 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 subsection (b) of this section, and he has designated as beneficiary his surviving spouse, who was married to him for at least one full year immediately prior to the date of his death, one-half of the retirement allowance to which the member would have been entitled if he had retired for service on the date of his death shall be paid to such surviving spouse who was his designated beneficiary at the date of his death, until such spouse's death or remarriage, or if there be no surviving spouse, to the unmarried child or children of such member under the age of eighteen years, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. If, at the death of such surviving spouse, who was receiving an allowance under this subdivision (2), there be one or more unmarried children of such member under the age of eighteen years, such allowance shall continue to such child or children, collectively, until every such child dies, marries or attains the age of eighteen years, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years.

If the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) is less than the benefit which was otherwise payable under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the amount of said benefit payable under subdivision (1) less an amount equal to the total of the payments of allowance made pursuant to this subdivision (2) shall be paid in a lump sum as follows:

(a) 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 unmarrie 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 redepot 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 retirement fund shall be subject to the same age requirements as apply to other members under this section for service retirement but he shall not be subject to a minimum service requirement. Upon the qualification of such member for retirement by reason of age, he shall be entitled to receive a retirement allowance which shall be the actuarial equivalent of his accumulated contributions and an equal amount of the contributions of the city and county, plus 1½ percent of his average final compensation for each year of service credited to him as rendered prior to his first membership in the retirement system. Upon the death of such member prior to retirement, his contributions with interest credited thereon shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary. 

(G) 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 entering him to membership in the retirement system under this section, provided that the accumulated contribution standing to the credit of such member shall be prorated by refund to the member or by payment of the member to bring the account at the time of such transfer to the amount which would have been credited to it had the member been a miscellaneous employee throughout the period of his service in either of such departments at the compensation he received in such departments. 

(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraphs (1) or (2) next preceding which is not deemed absence from service under the provisions of section 8.520 of the charter and for which such member is entitled to receive credit as service for the city and county by virtue of contributions made in accordance with the provisions of such section. 

(4) Prior service determined and credited as prescribed by the board of supervisors for persons who are members under section 8.507. 

(5) The board of supervisors, by ordinance enacted by a three-fourths vote of its members, may provide for the crediting as service under the retirement system of service, other than military service, rendered as an employee of the federal government and services rendered as an employee of the State of California or any public entity or public agency in the State of California. Said ordinance shall provide that all contributions required as the result of the crediting of such service shall be made by the member and that no contributions therefore shall be required of the city and county. 

(H) 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 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 manners and at times approved by the retirement board. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution 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, the member under Section 8.507, paragraph (a), as a basis for fixing the contributions to be made, and the benefits to be received, by the teacher under that retirement system shall be determined by the method provided in section 8.507, paragraph (a), and shall not be less than eighty percent 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.)

There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under Section 8.509 a sum equal to seven and one half percent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of, the member under Section 8.509 or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in Sections 8.509(e) and 8.509(f).

(2) Contributions based on time included in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (G), and deducted prior to July 1, 1947, from compensation of persons who become members under this section, and standing with interest thereon, to the credit of such members on the records of the retirement system on said date, shall continue to be credited to the individual accounts of said members and shall be combined with and administered in the same manner as the contributions deducted after said date.

(3) The total contributions, with interest thereon, made by or charged against the city and county standing to its credit, on July 1, 1948, in the accounts of the retirement system, on account of persons who become members under this section, shall be applied to provide the benefits under this section.

(4) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection (H), 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 the investigation into the experience under the system, of the benefits thereafter to be paid under this section, from contributions of the city and county, less the amount of such contributions, and plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective member after the date stated in the sentence next preceding, to the value at said respective dates of salaries thereafter payable to said members. Said values shall be determined by the actuary, who shall take into account the interest which shall be earned on said contributions, the compensation experience of members, and the probabilities of separation by all causes, of members from service before retirement and of death after retirement. Said percentage shall be changed only on the basis of said periodical actuarial valuation and investigation into the experience under the system. Said actuarial valuation shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision, any additional liabilities created by the amendments of this Section 8.509 contained in the proposition therefor submitted to the electorate on November 6, 1973, shall be amortized over a period of 30 years.

(5) To promote the stability of the retirement system, through a joint participation in the result of variations in the experience under mortality, investment and other contingencies, the contributions of both members and the city and county held by the system to provide the benefits under this section, shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included. Nothing in the section shall affect the obligations of the city and county to pay to the retirement system any amounts which may or shall become due under the provisions of the charter prior to the effective date hereof, and which are represented on July 1, 1947, in the accounts of said system by debits against the city and county.

(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.
(Proposition H, Continued)

(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) and (I) of this section, any member convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude committed in connection with his duties as an officer or employee of the City and County of San Francisco, shall, upon his removal from office or employment pursuant to the provisions of this charter, forfeit all rights to any benefits under the retirement system except refund of his accumulated 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 6, 1973, shall be effective on the first day of the month next following their ratification by the State Legislature. Said amendments do not and shall not increase any allowance first in effect prior to the effective date of said amendments, nor shall they give any person retired prior to said effective date, or his successors in interest, any claim against the city and county for any increase in any retirement allowance paid or payable for time prior to said effective date.

The amendment of Section 8.509 contained in the proposition submitted to the electorate on November 2, 1982 shall be effective July 1, 1983. (End)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT

PROPOSITION 1

NOTE: All Sections Are New.

The proposed Charter Amendment reads as follows:

8.590 Members of the Police Department after November 1, 1982

Those persons who become members of the Police Department as defined in Section 8.590-1, on or after November 2, 1982 shall be members of the subject to the provisions of sections 8.590, 8.590-1, 8.590-2, 8.590-3, 8.590-4, 8.590-5, 8.590-6, 8.590-7, 8.590-8, 8.590-9, 8.590-10, 8.590-11, 8.590-12, 8.590-13, 8.590-14, 8.590-15 (which shall apply only to members under section 8.590) in addition to the provisions contained in section 3.670 to 3.674 both inclusive, and section 6.314, 8.500, 8.510, 8.518, and 8.520 of this charter, notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this charter, and shall not be subject to any of the provisions of section 8.544, 8.559 or 8.586.

8.590-1 Definitions

The following words and phrases as used in this section, section 8.590 and sections 8.590-2 through 8.590-15, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall have the following meanings:

"Retirement allowance," "death allowance" or "allowance," shall mean equal monthly payments, beginning to accrue upon the date of retirement, or upon the day following the date of death, as the case may be, and continuing for life unless a different term of payment is definitely provided by the context.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member Act of the State of California, shall mean the remuneration payable in cash, by the city and county, without deduction except for absence from duty, for time during which the individual receiving such remuneration is a member of the police department, but excluding remuneration paid for overtime.

"Compensation earnable" shall mean the compensation which would have been earned had the member received compensation without interruption throughout the period under consideration and at the rates of remuneration attached at that time to the ranks or positions held by him during such period, it being assumed that during any absence, he was in the rank or position held by him at the beginning of the absence, and that prior to becoming a member of the police department, he was in the rank or position first held by him in such department.

"Benefit" shall include "allowance," "retirement allowance," "death allowance" and "death benefit."

"Final compensation" shall mean the average monthly compensation earnable by a member during any two consecutive years of credited service in which his average compensation is the highest.

For the purpose of sections 8.590 through 8.590-15, the terms "member of the police department," "member of the department," or "member" shall mean any officer or employee of the police department employed after November 1, 1982 who was or shall be subject to the charter provisions governing entrance requirements of members of the uniformed force of said department and said terms shall further mean persons employed after November 1, 1982 at an age not greater than the maximum age then prescribed for entrance into employment in said uniformed force, to perform duties now performed under the titles of criminologist, photographer, police woman or jail matron provided, however, that said terms shall not include any person who has not satisfactorily completed such course of training as may be employed by the Police Department prior to assignment to active duty with said Department.

"Retirement system" or "system" shall mean San Francisco City and Employees' Retirement System as created in section 8.500 of the charter.

"Retirement Board" shall mean "retirement board" as created in section 3.670 of this 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.
(Proposition I, Continued)

8.590-2 Retirement

Any member of the police department who completes at least twenty years of service in the aggregate, as service to be computed under section 8.590-10, 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 meeting the service requirement in the two sentences next preceding, shall receive a retirement allowance equal to forty (40) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1 plus an allowance at the rate of three (3) per cent of said final compensation for each year of service rendered in excess of twenty years; provided, however, that such retirement allowance shall not exceed seventy per cent of said member’s final compensation. If, at the date of retirement for service, or retirement for disability resulting from an injury received in the performance of duty, said member has no spouse, children or dependent parents, who would qualify for the continuance of the allowance after the death of said member, or with respect to the portion of the allowance which would not be continued regardless of dependents, or upon retirement for disability resulting from other causes, with respect to all of the allowance, and regardless of dependents at retirement, a member retired under this section or section 8.590-3, may elect before the first payment of the retirement allowance is made, to receive the actuarial equivalent of his allowance or the portion which would not be continued regardless of dependents, as the case may be, partly in a lesser 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 election by other members of the retirement system including the character and amount of such other benefits.

8.590-3 Retirement for Incapacity

Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duty by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, shall be retired. If he is not qualified for service retirement, he shall receive a retirement allowance in an amount which shall be equal to the same percentage of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1, as his percentage of disability is determined to be. The percentage of disability shall be as determined by the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board of the State of California upon referral from the retirement board for that purpose; provided that the retirement board may, by five (5) affirmative votes, adjust the percentage of disability as determined by said Appeals Board; and provided, further that such retirement allowance shall be in an amount not less than forty (40) per cent nor more than eighty (80) per cent of the final compensation of said member, as defined in section 8.590-1. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at retirement, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date based on the final compensation as defined in section 8.590-1, he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such final compensation.

If, at the time of retirement because of disability, he is qualified as to service for retirement under section 8.590-2, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired under section 8.590-2, but not less than forty (40) per cent of said final compensation. Any member of the police department who becomes incapacitated for performance of his duty, by reason of a cause not included under the provisions of the immediately preceding sentences, and who shall have completed at least ten years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, shall be retired upon an allowance of one and one-half per cent of the final compensation of said member as defined in section 8.590-1 for each year of service, provided that said allowance shall not be less than thirty (30) per cent of said final compensation; provided, however, that if such member has completed at least 20 years of service in the aggregate, computed as provided in section 8.590-10, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance he would have received if he were retired under section 8.590-2 as of the date of retirement for such incapacity. The questions of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board’s own motion, by recommendation of the Police Commission, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the rank and position he occupied at the time of his retirement.

8.590-4 Death Allowance

If a member of the police department shall die before or after retirement by reason of an injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of his duty, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable under any other section of the charter or by ordinance, on account of death resulting from injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, shall be paid, beginning on the date next following the date of death, to the surviving spouse throughout their life or until their remarriage. If the member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of the final compensation earnable by said member immediately preceding death. If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the final compensation of said member at the date of death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement, had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the rank held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, based on the final compensation he would have received immediately prior to said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than forty (40) per cent of such monthly final compensation. If he had retired prior to death, for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if he
was a member under section 8.590 and retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for the service retirement allowance, the allowance continued shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement, in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died. If there be no surviving spouse entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if they die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which surviving spouse would have received had they lived and not remarried shall be paid to the 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 spouse and no children under the age of eighteen years, but leaves a child or children, regardless of age, dependent upon him for support because partially or totally disabled and unable to earn a livelihood or a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the child or children and the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving spouse otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving spouse unless she was married to the member prior to the date of 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 death if he had retired.

As used in this section and section 8.590-4, “surviving spouse” shall 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 spouse, in the event of death of the member after qualification for but before service retirement, may elect before the first payment of the allowance, to receive the benefit provided in section 8.590-8, in lieu of the allowance which otherwise would be continued to her under this section, if there be no surviving spouse, the guardian of the eligible child or children may make such election, and if there be no such children, the dependent parent or parents may make such election. “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 8.590 are subject, shall mean completion of twenty (20) years of service, said service to be computed under section 8.590-10.

8.590-6 Adjustment of Allowance

Every retirement or death allowance payable to or on account of any member under section 8.590 shall be increased or decreased as of July 1, 1983, and on July 1 of each succeeding year by an amount equal to fifty per cent of any increase or decrease, respectively, in the rate of remuneration attached to the rank or position upon which such retirement or death allowance was based; provided, however, that no allowance shall be reduced below the amount being received by a member or his beneficiary on June 30, 1983, or on the date such member or beneficiary began to receive the allowance, whichever is later.

8.590-7 Adjustment for Compensation Payments

That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member of the police department which is provided by contributions of the city and county, shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors, by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits, payable by the
city and county to or on account of such person, under any workers' compensation law or any other general law and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty, shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under such law and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

8.590-8 Death Benefit
If a member of the police department shall die, before retirement from causes other than an injury received in or illness caused by the performance of duty, or regardless of cause, if no allowance shall be payable under section 8.590-4 or 8.590-5 preceding, a death benefit shall be paid to his estate or designated beneficiary, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system. 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, the amount of which and the conditions for the payment of which shall be determined in the manner prescribed by the board of supervisors for the death benefit of other members of the retirement system.

8.590-9 Refunds and Redeposit
Should any member of the police department cease to be employed as such a member, through any cause other than death or retirement or transfer to another office or department, all of his contributions, with interest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him subject to the conditions prescribed by the board of supervisors to govern similar terminations of employment of other members of the retirement system. If he shall again become a member of the department, he shall redeposit in the retirement fund, the amount refunded to him. Contributions, with interest, which are credited because of service rendered in any other office or department and which will not be counted under section 8.590-10, to any person who becomes a member of the retirement system under this section, shall be refunded to him forthwith. Should a member of the police department become an employee of any other office or department, his accumulated contribution account shall be adjusted by payments to or from him as the case may be to make the accumulated contributions credited to him if he had been employed in said other office or department equal to the rate of compensation received by him in the police department and he shall receive credit for service for which said contributions were made, according to the charter section under which his membership in the retirement system continues.

8.590-10 Computation of Service
The following time shall be included in the computation of the service to be credited to a member of the police department for the purpose of determining whether such member qualified for retirement and calculating benefits, excluding, however, any time, the contributions for which were withdrawn by said member upon termination of his service while he was a member under any other charter section, and not redeposited upon reentry into service:
(1) Time during and for which said member is entitled to receive compensation because of services as a member of the police or fire department.
(2) Time during and for which said member was entitled to receive compensation under section 8.559 and 8.586 if said member elects to transfer as specified in 8.590-14.
(3) Time during which said member is absent from a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of service in the armed forces of the United States of America, or by reason of any other service included in section 8.520 of the charter, during any war in which the United States was or shall be engaged or during other national emergency, and for which said member contributed or contributes to the retirement system or from which the city and county contributed or contributes on his account.

8.590-11 Sources of Funds
All payments provided for members under section 8.590 shall be made from funds derived from the following sources, plus interest earned on said funds:
(1) There shall be deducted from each payment of compensation made to a member under section 8.590 a sum equal to seven and one-half (7½) per cent of such payment of compensation. The sum so deducted shall be paid forthwith to the retirement system. Said contribution shall be credited to the individual account of the member from whose salary it was deducted, and the total of said contributions, together with interest credited thereon in the same manner as is prescribed by the board of supervisors for crediting interest to contributions of other members of the retirement system, shall be applied to provide part of the retirement allowance granted to, or allowance granted on account of said member, or shall be paid to said member or his estate or beneficiary as provided in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.
(2) The city and county shall contribute to the retirement system such amounts as may be necessary, when added to the contributions referred to in paragraph (1) of this section 8.590-11, to provide the benefits payable to members under section 8.590. Such contributions of the city and county to provide the portion of the benefits hereunder 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 compensation paid during said year to persons who are members under section 8.590, said percentage to the ratio of the value on November 2, 1982, 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 to or on account of members under section 8.590 from contributions of the city and county less the amount of such contributions plus accumulated interest thereon, then held by said system to provide said benefits on account of service rendered by respective members after said date, to the value on 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
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... tion shall be made every even-numbered year and said investigation into the experience under the system shall be made every odd-numbered year.

(3) 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 benefits for members under section 8.590 shall be a part of the fund in which all other assets of said system are included.

8.590-12 Right to Retire

Upon the completion of the years of service set forth in section 8.590-2 as requisite to retirement, a member of the police department shall be entitled to retire at any time thereafter in accordance with the provisions of said section 8.590-2, and nothing shall deprive said member of said right.

8.590-13 Limitation on Employment During Retirement

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no person retired as a member under section 8.590 for service or disability and entitled to receive a retirement allowance under the retirement system shall be employed in any capacity by the city and county, nor shall such person receive any payment for services rendered to the city and county after retirement.

(b) (1) Service as an election officer or juror, or in the preparation for, or giving testimony as an expert witness for or on behalf of the city and county before any court or legislative body shall not be affected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. (2) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such retired person from serving on any board or commission of the city and county and receiving the compensation for such office. (3) If such retired person is elected or appointed to a position or office which subjects him to membership in the retirement system under section 8.590, he shall re-enter membership under section 8.590 and his retirement allowance shall be cancelled immediately upon such re-entry. The provisions of subsection (a) shall not prevent such person from receiving the compensation for such position or office. The rate of contribution of such member shall be the same as that for other members under section 8.590. Such member's individual account shall be credited with an amount which is the actuarial equivalent of his annuity at the time of his re-entry, but the amount thereof shall not exceed the amount of his accumulated contributions at the time of his retirement. Such member shall also receive credit for his service as it was at the time of his retirement.

8.590-14 Right to Transfer

Notwithstanding any provisions of this charter to the contrary, any person who, on or after January 1, 1983, is a member of the Police Department, and is a member of the Retirement System under Charter Sections 8.559 or 8.586, may become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 by filing in writing with the Retirement System no later than June 30, 1984, an executed waiver of all benefits which might inure to him under Charter Section 8.559 or 8.586. This waiver must be without right of revocation and on a form furnished by the retirement system. The Retirement Board may require that this waiver be executed by additional persons before it becomes operative. Member's exercising their right of transfer under this subsection shall leave in the Retirement System monies in their contribution account including any interest thereon.

This transfer will be effective the pay period nearest 30 days after the signing of the waiver. Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall receive service credit under Charter Section 8.590 equal to their service credit under Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the date their transfer became effective.

Those persons so electing to become members under Charter Section 8.590 shall not be subject to any of those provisions of Charter Section 8.559 and 8.586 as of the effective date of their transfer.

Provided however, that those members who exercised their right to transfer, pursuant to Charter Section 8.559-14, from membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.559 to membership of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.586 shall not be entitled to elect to become a member of the Retirement System under Charter Section 8.590 unless and until they have redeposited with the Retirement System all monetary consideration, including monies from their contribution account including any interest thereon, received from electing to so transfer.


Any section or part of any section in this charter, insofar as it should conflict with the provisions of section 8.590 through 8.590-14 with any part thereof, shall be suspended by the contents of said section. In the event that any word, phrase, clause or section of said sections shall be adjudged unconstitutional, the remainder thereof shall remain in full force and effect, and shall not be changed by vote of less than a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the electorate.

8.519 Disability Benefits

Whenever any member of the police department, as defined in Section 8.590-1 is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in, or illness caused by, the performance of his duty, as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled with respect to any one injury or illness, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding 12 months in the aggregate, or until such earlier date as he is retired, whether for service or disability.

Said disability benefit shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits other than medical benefits payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit, and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits other than medical benefits under the workers' compensation laws included in said Labor Code, shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the Labor Code.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement system during each
(Proposition I. Continued)

fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability benefits paid by said system during that year.

A member of the police department shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system, for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and receives said disability benefit; provided,

however, that contributions for the retirement system shall be deducted from payments of such disability benefits paid to him. The city and county shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as it would contribute on salary paid to said member. (end)

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION J

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

8.451 Police Department

(a) The word “member” or “members” as used in this section shall mean the members in the police department set forth in section 3.531 of this charter.

(b) The basic week of service for each member shall be forty hours and the annual compensation set forth in Section 3.531 of this charter shall be based upon said basic week of service.

(c) Each member shall be entitled to at least two days off during each week, except as hereinafter provided.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve in excess of the basic week of service during any week, the chief of police may permit said service, and said member shall be compensated therefor or shall receive equivalent time credited to him in lieu thereof in accordance with this sub-section. For service performed in excess of the basic week of service, member shall, as requested by the member, be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said excess service bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531 or in lieu thereof equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to interfere with a vacation, as provided for in Section 8.440 of this charter, or the normal days off per week; provided, however, that when in the judgment of the chief of police public interest or necessity requires the services of any member to serve on his vacation, or part thereof, or normal days off, and he shall receive additional compensation for the period so served. Said additional compensation shall be computed on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half in accordance with the ratio which said extra service performed bears to the basic week of service and the annual compensation provided therefor in Section 3.531.

(f) Nothing in this section shall abridge or limit in any way the provisions of Section 301, Part 1 of the San Francisco Municipal Code, approving rule 32 of the civil service commission, insofar as sick leave and disability leaves for members are concerned.

(g) Whenever in the judgment of the police commission the efficient performance of police duty requires that one or more members of the police department should report for roll call, orders, and assignments, prior to going on duty, the said commission may designate a period not to exceed fifteen minutes in any one day for said reporting, and the said periods of fifteen minutes need not be compensated for in money or in time off with pay.

(h) Notwithstanding the provisions of any of the foregoing sub-sections, the members of the police department shall be entitled to the days declared to be holidays for employees whose compensations are fixed on a monthly basis in the schedules of compensations adopted by the board of supervisors pursuant to the provisions of Section 8.401 of the charter as additional days off with pay. Members shall be compensated on the basis of ((straight time)) time and one-half as herein computed or shall be granted equivalent time off duty with pay at the rate of time and one-half ((in the judgment of the police commission)) as requested by the member.

(i) The provisions of this section changing compensation for service in excess of the basic week of service from straight time compensation and equivalent time off duty with pay to time and one-half for compensation and for time off duty with pay shall be effective on and after July 1, 1983.

TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE ORDINANCE
PROPOSITION K

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

That, in order to bring about lower electricity rates for the residents of San Francisco, and in furtherance of the stated policy of the City and County of San Francisco, as embodied in Charter Section 3.599, which states:

"It is the declared purpose and intention of the people of the city and county, when public interest and necessity demand, that public utilities be gradually acquired and ultimately owned by the city and county."

the following steps be taken in order to bring about public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco:

1. That within 90 days of the passage of this ordinance the Board of Supervisors shall begin hearings on the scope of a study to determine the feasibility of public ownership of the electric utility in San Francisco, which hearings are to include public testimony and to be conducted at times of day conducive to the widest possible public participation. The scope of such feasibility study shall include, but not be limited to: determination of the cost of acquisition of such electric facilities as may be necessary for adequate provision of electric utility service within the city and county; determination of the potential revenue to a municipally owned system providing such services; determination of rates chargeable to consumers by such
TEXT OF PROPOSED INITIATIVE DECLARATION OF POLICY
PROPOSITION M

The proposed declaration of policy reads as follows:

1. That, after conclusion of the hearings mentioned in paragraph 1, above, and within 150 days of passage of this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors shall authorize the acceptance of bids on the feasibility study. Bids for this study shall be accepted, and determination of a contractor shall be made by the Public Utilities Commission after public hearings concerning the qualifications of the bidders to carry out

and running westerly 35,807 feet to the westerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 89°39'26" to the right and running northerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 28,715 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 28,715 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,234 feet; thence deflecting 89°21'10" to the left and running easterly 35,808 feet; thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 30,424 feet; thence deflecting 89°26'39" to the left and running westerly 35,807 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 3:
PORTIONS of Lots 45 and 46, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the westerly line of said Lot 45, distant thereon 58,949 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance of 31,051 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 45; thence deflecting 95°57'20" to the left and running easterly along the southerly line of said Lots 45 and 46, a distance of 44,798 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running northerly parallel with the westerly line of said Lot 45, a distance 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence...
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at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle southerly 5 feet, thence deflecting 90°38'50" to the right and running westerly 35.808 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 4:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of said Lot 47, distant thereon 33.90 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; running thence southerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 56.10 feet to the southerly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the right and running westerly along the southerly line of said Lots 47 and 46, a distance of 30.202 feet; thence deflecting 93°57'20" to the right and running northerly parallel with the easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 26 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 2.95 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 5 feet; thence at a right angle westerly 5.80 feet; thence at a right angle northerly 28.426 feet; thence deflecting 90°16'53" to the right and running easterly 38.790 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 5:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 46 and 47, as shown upon "Map of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, San Francisco, California," filed in Book "H" of Maps at pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the point of intersection of the southerly line of Carl Street and the easterly line of Lot 47, above referred to; running thence westerly along said southerly line of Carl Street 39 feet; thence deflecting 84°02'40" to the left and running southerly parallel with said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 29.662 feet; thence deflecting 89°43'05" to the left and running easterly 38.790 feet to the easterly line of said Lot 47; thence deflecting 90°16'55" to the left and running northerly along said easterly line of said Lot 47, a distance of 33.90 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 6:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 32 and 33, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, Volume "H" of Maps, Pages 22 and 23, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 155 feet southerly from the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 7:
PORTIONS OF LOTS Nos. 31 and 32, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," filed July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 130 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street and running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 8:
PORTIONS OF LOTS 30 and 31, as the same are laid down, numbered and delineated upon that certain map entitled "Map of Parkwood Heights," July 16, 1914, in Volume "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23, in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 105 feet southerly from a point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street, running thence southerly along said easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly and parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence westerly and parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the point of commencement.

PARCEL 9:
BEGINNING at a point on the easterly line of Hillway Avenue, distant thereon 80 feet southerly from the point formed by the intersection of the easterly line of Hillway Avenue with the southerly line of Carl Street; and running thence southerly along said line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; thence easterly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet; thence northerly parallel with the easterly line of Hillway Avenue 25 feet; and thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Carl Street 100.54 feet to the easterly line of Hillway Avenue and the point of beginning.

BEING the northerly 25 feet, front and rear measurements, of Lot No. 30 of PARKWOOD HEIGHTS, as per map thereof filed July 16, 1914, in the Office of the County Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and of record in Book "H" of Maps, pages 22 and 23.

PARCEL 10:
Lots 27, 28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 48 and 49 as shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of Parkwood Heights, San Francisco, California," which Map was filed for record in the Office of the Recorder of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, on July 16, 1914, in Book "H" of Maps, at pages 22 and 23.

Also known as ASSESSOR'S LOTS 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 42A, 43, 44, 45 and 46, of Block 1275.
BART DISTRICTS
District #8—shaded area

NOTE

Only voters in BART District #8 will be voting on BART Candidates this year.

District #8 consists of the following neighborhoods:
Sunset (part), West of Twin Peaks, Excelsior, Bernal Heights (part), Upper Market, Diamond Heights, Noe Valley, Visitacion Valley, Ingleside and Lake Merced.

On your mailing address label your four-digit precinct number appears immediately above your first name (see back cover). If the second digit of your precinct number is a 4, a 5 or a 6 (example: 0411) then you are in BART District #8.
APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT
APLICACIÓN PARA BALOTA DE VOTANTE AUSENTE

1. PRINTED NAME
LETTER DE IMPRINTA
application must also be signed below by applicant.
Signature will be compared with affidavit on file in this office.

2. ELECTION DATE
November 2, 1982
I hereby apply for an Absent Voter's Ballot for the election indicated above.

3. BALLOT TO BE MAILED TO ME AT:
ENVIEME LA BALOTA A:

Registered San Francisco Address of Applicant
Dirección del solicitante registrada en San Francisco

SD: 000000
Area Postal

NOTE: A voter moving within 29 days prior to this election may obtain an absentee ballot. A voter moving more than 29 days prior to this election and who did not re-register prior to the registration closing date for this election is not eligible to vote.

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

De: 00000
My current address is: ____________________________

My address is: ____________________________

Mail to:
ENVIAR A:

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 158, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

NOTA: Un votante que se cambie dentro de los 29 días anteriores a esta elección puede obtener balota ausente. Un votante que se cambie antes de los 29 días anteriores de la elección y que no se registre antes de la fecha final para registrarse de esta elección no puede votar.

6. □ I prefer election materials in English
□ Prefero materiales electorales en español
□ 我欲索取中文選舉資料

7. Date
Deputy Registrar

Signature and Registration
Confirmed as Correct:

DATE: ____________________________
Fechado: ____________________________

SF: 000000
Area Postal

Signature of Applicant in Full
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE

Signature and Registration
Confirmed as Correct:

DATE: ____________________________
Fechado: ____________________________
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propositions</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOTER SELECTION COUNCIL**

**VOTER INDEX**

See index at the top of this pamphlet.

Your rights as a handicapped voter have been considered. If you have any questions, please bring your voter registration card or other identification to the polls.

This pamphlet is available in print or electronically at the following locations:

- City Hall
- Library
- City Hall

**WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:**

**TYPE OF BALLOT:**

8000

**CUT AT TEAR ALONG DOTTED LINES**

**MAILING ADDRESS:**

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

**ELECTION**

558-3417

**REGISTRAR OF VOTERS**

155 CITY HALL

**JAY PATTERSON**