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### Candidates for Judge

- Alfred G. Chiantelli | 21 |
- Patricia (Pat) Lucey | 21 |

### Candidates for BART Director

- Robert Barnes | 22 |
- Bob Geary | 23 |
- Eugene Garfinke | 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 Moncur | 31 |
- "Belle Starr" Mosley | 31 |
- Wendy Nelder | 32 |
- Robert Squier | 32 |
- Olga Talamante | 33 |
- William Tocco | 33 |
- Ben Tom | 34 |
- Nancy G. Walker | 34 |
- Doris Ward | 35 |
- Dave Wharton | 35 |

### Candidates for Community College Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Bacci</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike S. Bernick</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Burton</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. DaPrato</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland Moglen</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Riordan</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Rosselli</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan S. Wong</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 remarried 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.

### Propositions

#### 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 7¾% 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 Law: 100-101
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### Governor

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

### Lieutenant Governor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON A. MYERS, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auto Businessman/Comerciante de Automóviles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEO T. MC CATHY, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblyman, California Legislature/Asambleista, de la Legislatura de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. VERNON, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant Consultant/Caterer/Consultor de Restaurante/Proveedor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLYDE KUHN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Party Secretary/Secretario Estatal de Partido Polítics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL HALLETT, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Legislator/Farmer/Legislador Estatal/Granjero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Occupation/Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED W. SMITH, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Propiedades Inmobiliarias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON DUFFY, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legislador del Estado de California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON SHIRO TAKEI, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warehouse Worker/Trabajador de Almacén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN E. BUERGER, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Consultant/Consultor de Comercio</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</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 de Berkeley</td>
<td>柏克萊市市參議員</td>
<td>27 ↓</td>
<td>27 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES L. FLOURNOY, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Attorney at Law/Abogado</td>
<td>律師</td>
<td>28 ↓</td>
<td>28 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNETH CORY, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>California State Controller/Contralor del Estado de California</td>
<td>加州審計官</td>
<td>29 ↓</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>運輸服務經理</td>
<td>30 ↓</td>
<td>30 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;PAT&quot; GRAHAM, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businesswoman/Mujer Comerciante</td>
<td>女商人</td>
<td>31 ↓</td>
<td>31 ↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Treasurer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS ANTMAN, Libertarian</td>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>Certified Public Accountant/Contador Público Letrado</td>
<td>審定公共會計師</td>
<td>35 ↓</td>
<td>35 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN AKIN, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steelworker/Herrero de Obra</td>
<td>鋼鐵工人</td>
<td>36 ↓</td>
<td>36 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONALD J. FRENCH, Republican</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Corporate Treasurer/Tesorero Corporativo</td>
<td>企業財務人員</td>
<td>37 ↓</td>
<td>37 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE M. UNRUH, Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>State Treasurer/Tesorero Estatal</td>
<td>州司庫</td>
<td>38 ↓</td>
<td>38 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. CHARLTON, American Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyst/Analista</td>
<td>分析員</td>
<td>39 ↓</td>
<td>39 ↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attorney General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>洛杉磯縣地方檢察官</td>
<td>42 ↓</td>
<td>42 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTHOLOMEW (BART) LEE, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Liberties Attorney/Abogado de Libertad Civil</td>
<td>民事自由律師</td>
<td>43 ↓</td>
<td>43 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN SIEGEL, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Lawyer/Abogado Laboral</td>
<td>勞工律師</td>
<td>44 ↓</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>資深副司法廳長</td>
<td>45 ↓</td>
<td>45 ↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
<th>Vote por Uno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDY PAUL KANGAS, Peace and Freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Reform Advocate/Proponente de la Reforma de Impuestos</td>
<td>稅收改革委員人才</td>
<td>49 ↓</td>
<td>49 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONWAY H. COLLIS, Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Board of Equalization, Assistant Member, First District/Departamento de Hacienda, Membr nonveinta, los distritos</td>
<td>州平等局第一區委員委員</td>
<td>50 ↓</td>
<td>50 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE R. NYGREEN, Libertarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Businessman/Anti-Tax Advocate/Comerciante/Proponente Contra los Impuestos</td>
<td>商人／反稅收參議員</td>
<td>51 ↓</td>
<td>51 ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM H. &quot;BILL&quot; IVERS, Republican</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Legislator/Legisador del Estado de California</td>
<td>加州立法委員</td>
<td>52 ↓</td>
<td>52 ↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### United States Senator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THERESA &quot;TENA&quot; DIETRICHS, American Independent</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID WALD, Peace and Freedom Solar Engineer, Teacher/Ingeniero Solar, Maestro</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE WILSON, Republican Mayor of San Diego/Alcalde de San Diego</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH FUHRIG, Libertarian Professor of Economics/Profesor de Economía</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Democratic Governor of California/Gobernador de California</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representative in Congress—5th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILTON MARKS, Republican State Senator 5th District/Senador Estatal, Distrito No. 5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP BURTON, Democratic Member of the United States Congress/Miembro del Congreso Estado Unidense</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIN RAIMONDO, Libertarian Newspaper Editor/Editor (Redactor) de Periódico</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member of the Assembly—16th Assembly District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART AGNOS, Democratic State Assemblyman/Asambleista Estatal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON A. BLOYER, Republican Management Consultant/Consultor de Gerente</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank K. Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen E. Broussard</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz Reynoso</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph R. Grodin</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome A. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Wayne White</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>For Associate Justice, Court of Appeal</td>
<td>Para Juez Asociado del Tribunal de Apelación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District, Division Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall BETTY BARRY-DEAL be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>应否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá BETTY BARRY-DEAL ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期内選任本公職？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District, Division Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall WINSLOW CHRISTIAN be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>应否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá WINSLOW CHRISTIAN ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期内選任本公職？</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Appellate District, Division Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shall MARC POCHE be elected to the office for the term prescribed by law?</td>
<td>应否在法律指定之任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¿Deberá MARC POCHE ser elegido al puesto para el término que dicta la ley?</td>
<td>期内選任本公職？</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>Title/Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATRICIA (PAT) LUCEY</td>
<td>Attorney/Abogada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALFRED G. CHIANTELLI</td>
<td>Assistant District Attorney/Asistente de Fiscal</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>Title/Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SILVESTRI</td>
<td>Transportation Engineering Consultant/Consultor de Ingeniería de Transporte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT BARNES</td>
<td>Law Librarian/Bibliotecario de Leyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUGENE GARFINKLE</td>
<td>BART Board President/Presidente de la Junta BART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB GEARY</td>
<td>Anti-Sewer Tax Chairman/Jefe Contra Impuestos de Alcantarillado</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

**Wilson Riles**  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction/Superventente Estatal de Instrucción Pública  
加州教育局长  
投票人数: 134

**Bill Honig**  
District School Superintendent/Superventente de Distrito Escolar  
校區學監  
投票人数: 135

### Member, Board of Education

**Miembro, Junta de Educacion de San Francisco**  
教育局委員會  
投票不能超過三名

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</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</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 Economia</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Crichton Deosuna</td>
<td>Real Estate Broker/Corredor de Bienes Raices</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myra Kofp</td>
<td>Incumbent/En el Cargo</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Member, Community College Board

**Miembro, Junta del Colegio de la Comunidad de San Francisco**  
社區大學校董  
最多選三人

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Vote</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 Riodan</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. Da Prato</td>
<td>Physician/Educator/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>Name</td>
<td>Position/Professional Title</td>
<td>City/County/Country/Condo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIANA COLEMAN</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Sindicato Socialist</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD D. HONGSTO</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE WHARTON</td>
<td>Public Service Attorney/Abogado de Servicio Público</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS M. WARD</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANCY G. WALKER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT SCUERI</td>
<td>Independent Businessman/Hombre de Negocios</td>
<td>独立商人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN FARMER</td>
<td>Hotel Bellman/Botones de Hotel</td>
<td>旅館待者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLGA TALAMANTE</td>
<td>Administrator, Mission YMCA/Administradora, YMCA de la Misión</td>
<td>米慎街基督教男青年會主任</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM TOCCO</td>
<td>Tax Consultant/Consultor de Impuestos</td>
<td>稅務顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN TOM</td>
<td>Member, San Francisco Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación de San Francisco</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENDY NELDER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Supervisors/Miembro, Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIAN LAGOS</td>
<td>Housing Activist/Activista de Viviendas</td>
<td>房屋問題活動份子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN LEE ENG</td>
<td>Merchant/Bible Preacher/Comerciante/Predicador de la Biblia</td>
<td>商人／聖經傳道者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW (DADDY ANDY) JONES</td>
<td>Criminology Student/Estudiante de Criminología</td>
<td>犯罪學生</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BRADLEY</td>
<td>Social Union Militant/Militante de Unión Socialista</td>
<td>社會主義聯盟鬥士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISTER BOOM BOOM</td>
<td>Nun of the Above/Monja del Cielo</td>
<td>上天女修士</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG DAY</td>
<td>Community Activist, Journalist/Activista de la Comunidad, Periodista</td>
<td>社區活躍人士，新聞從業員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. DeYOUNG</td>
<td>Word Processor/Writer/Procesador de Palabras/Escritor</td>
<td>文字處理員／作家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DOLSON</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors/Junta de Supervisores</td>
<td>市参議員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS LEONARD ANTHONY KEYES</td>
<td>Musician, Composer/Músico, Compositor</td>
<td>音樂家、作曲家</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTY ANN McMahon</td>
<td>School District Consultant/Consultora de Distrito Escolar</td>
<td>校區顧問</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MAHER</td>
<td>Member, Board of Education/Miembro, Junta de Educación</td>
<td>教育委員</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.F. &quot;BELLE STARR&quot; MOSELEY</td>
<td>Artist-Attorney-Activist/Artista-Abogado-Activista</td>
<td>藝術家、律師、活動分子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC MONCUR</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser, Consultant/Evaluador de Bienes Raíces, Consultor</td>
<td>實業評值員、顧問</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 $35,000,000.</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>NÚMERO</td>
<td>PROPUESTA</td>
<td>DESCRIPCIÓN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<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 mayoría 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. Esta acta permite la construcción, reconstrucción, remodelación y reposición de cárcel de condado ejecución de mantenimiento diferido en las mismos 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 $460,000,000 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 para evitar el deterioro ambiental de este recurso natural único, para proteger las aguas de Lake Tahoe de degradación adicional y preservar los valores lúdicos 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 aumentar las recaudaciones de porcentaje mayor en tipos prescritos de acciones comunes. Prohibe 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 acercar pérdidas a los fondos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 →
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TASACION. VALUACION DE LA PROPIEDAD INMUEBLE. Permite a la Legislatura excluir de la construcción de sistemas de extinción de incendios por rociadura automática o sistemas de alarme de la definición de "reconstrucción". Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumente: Pérdida desconocida para gobiernos 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, bienes 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.

地方政府暫時轉移資金用作維修，修整限制，價值基點由應計 “稅捐” 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，非借款機構原可賺取的利息則受到削減。

TRANSFERENCIA TEMPORAL DE FONDOS POR Gobiernos Locales para Mantenimiento. Cambia las bases de los límites y pago de impuestos a la propiedad. Impacto fiscal: Ningún impacto fiscal hasta su instrumentación. Cuando se instrumente: Pérdida desconocida para gobiernos 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, bienes 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.

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 sus condados para los jueces elevados, y costos administrativos desconocidos o ajustados, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

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：要在付諸實施後才會發生影響，一旦付諸實施，州與/或縣會因升職法官而付更高薪資而增加薪資和退休金的開支。行政費或可能節省的經費，數目不詳，各縣可能差異很大。

TEXTOS ESCOLARES. ESCUELAS NO PÚBLICAS. Autoriza la provisión de textos en una base 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 sus condados para los jueces elevados, y costos administrativos desconocidos o ajustados, que podrían variar sustancialmente entre los condados.

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

飲料容器，規定退回來的空罐，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定。可能會減少垃圾的清理費和固體廢料處理費，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。

ARMAS NUCLEARES. Requiere que el Gobernador la 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.

核武器，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。
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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 $1.48 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>13</th>
<th>YES 237</th>
<th>NO 238</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>14</th>
<th>YES 241</th>
<th>NO 242</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>15</th>
<th>YES 245</th>
<th>NO 246</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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?

| 249 | 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?

| 252 | 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?

| 256 | 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?

| 259 | YES 259 | NO 260 |
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RECURSOS HIDROÚNICOS. Agrega estatutos con respecto a programas de conservación entre cuencas, permite asignaciones para aguas fuertes, uso del río Stanislavski y reglamentación del consumo escaso crítico de agua (fríos). Impacto fiscal: No puede determinarse el efecto fiscal general. Podría resultar en costos anuales de $14.84 millones durante 6 años para el Consejo Estatal de Control de Recursos Hidráulicos; costos desconocidos de planificación, administrativos y de instrumentación; costos desconocidos de legislación; pérdida desconocida de restricciones de corrección eléctrica y alteraciones desconocidas de largo plazo en costos reducidos para la adición de nueva agua. El cálculo del Analista detalla factores que intervienen.


ARMAS DE FUEGO. Requiere la registración de revólveres y pistolas. Limita el número de revólveres y pistolas permitidas en el Estado. Prohíbe la proscripción legislativa de la posesión de armas de fuego. Impacto fiscal: Impacto imposible de determinar. Aumenta los costos administrativos reembolsados completos o parcialmente por costos. Impacto desconocido sobre el costo de mantenimiento del sistema de justicia criminal. Puede afectar los réditos de impuestos a la venta y a la renta. Vea el cálculo del Analista para detalles de los variables.

PROPOSICIONES DE CIUDAD Y CONDADO

249 SI Proponen A ¿Debe establecerse en el Departamento de Policía una Unidad para para Questas de Ciudadanos, con la autoridad de investigar quejas de ciudadanos sobre mal acto de policías, y recomendar acción al Jefe de Policía?

250 NO Reprime

252 SI Proponen B ¿Debe la adquisición de vehículos que representen ingresos para el Municipal Railway, y estructuras y equipos relacionados, exceder de un 10 de cada $100 de esfuerzo de propiedad tenedor de la requisiación de que las adquisiciones que excedan esta cantidad sean adquiridas mediante la emisión de bonos?

253 NO Reprime

256 SI Proponen C ¿Debe autorizar a la Junta de Supervisión a emitir bonos para el servicio de parte de su equipo de instalación, y mejorar instalaciones apropiadas para uso industrial, de manufactura, investigación y otros, con solo limitación de que las partes particulares y sin crear ninguna deuda o obligación sobre la Ciudad?

257 NO Reprime

259 SI Proponen D ¿Debe la ciudad subvencionar a los cónyuges sobrevivientes de los muertos, que estén activos o jubilados, a la misma manera que la ciudad subvenciona a los empleados activos o jubilados pertenecientes al Sistema de Servicio de Salud?

260 NO Reprime
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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 7½% 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Voto</th>
<th>Pregunta</th>
<th>Resumen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Deberá permitir el cónyuge sobreviviente de un miembro del Sistema de Jubilaciones que está recibiendo una pensión por jubilación continuar recibiendo dicha pensión si el cónyuge sobreviviente cumple con los requisitos?</td>
<td>Retiro del estado de las pensiones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe pagar a cada miembro de la Junta de Supervisores un salario de $23,924 por año?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe pagar el 7½% de su salario a los empleados municipales que trabajan por más de 40 años?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe crear un Plan de Jubilación e Incapacidad para empleados del Departamento de Policía contratados después del 1 de noviembre de 1982?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe pagar a los Oficiales de Policía por tiempo y medio o día festivo y medio, por trabajar horas extra o por trabajo en condiciones peligrosas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe pagar a los empleados del Departamento de Policía por tiempo y medio, por trabajar horas extra o por trabajo en condiciones peligrosas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe construir rampas de acceso en la Calle Van Ness en la Ciudad de San Francisco?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>¿Debe permitir el desarrollo de viviendas de lujo en el área de Pacoima, Los Angeles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 SHARED 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. 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 Ocomandy, Albert Wollenberg, 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 Karish, James Kearney, Beatrice Laws, Gloria Lee, Caroline Moran, Cornelius McCarthy, Myrl Northway, Anna Payne, Jasper Perno, James Putcell, Jose Reinsosa, 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.
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 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 flammable 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. "Jay" Jacobs, 2962 Fillmore, Astrologer
Paula Hoot, 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
Christian H. Keith, 525-8th Ave, Punk Dilettante
Anne Diedrich, 721A Shotwell, Apathetic Protestant
Leonard Boyer, 937 Haight, Clerk
Laura Kristl, 1996 Fell, Theatre Director
James Oakley, 1716 Fell, Fairy Priest
James K. Nash, 715A Central Ave, Blood Spinner
Paul W. Kruevich, 33 Pearl, Soo Rep.
Randolph C. Hunt, 2126 Steiner, Unemployed
Sister Boom Boom, 2101 California St, Nun of the above
Stuart A. Guzman, 222 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, 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, 733-11th 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, 753 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 Mangel, 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, 335-16th 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, 4402-30th St., President, Community College Board
Harry G. Britt, 3622-16th St., Member Board of Supervisors
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Planning Commissioner
Robert E. Bunon, 2751-41st Ave., Commissioner Worker's Comp.
App. Bo.
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 Realtors
Robert DeVries, 3518-29th 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
Forbesodene Kill, 2801 Broadway, Attorney
Quentin L. Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John Maher, 2563 Divisadero St., Executive
Geo. L. Newkirk, 534 Brussels, Dr. 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, 56-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. Webb, 100 Mocada, Retired Police Inspector
Timothy B. Welker, 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. 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 St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Libby Denebom, 2120 Stierlitz 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. Boschetto, 10 Chaves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamonte, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Coblenz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Anne Bellisle Daley, 795 Geary, Executive Director
Ina Deerman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Gregory Hurst, 340 San Benito, Executive
Leroy King, 75 Sante Lane, Legislative Director I.L.W.U.
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., Analyst
Will Leong, 1467-12th Ave., Executive Director
William Moskowitz, 1172 California, Retired
Jane McKeachie 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, 321-16th St., Catholic Priest
Thomas C. Scanlon, 613 Vicente, Retired City Treasurer
Sunley M. Smith, 411 Felton, Labor Union Official
Dorothy Vukovich, 177 Aleso, Fund Raising Coordinator
Yorita Wada, 56-4th Ave., Agency Executive
John J. "Jack" Webb, 100 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 80 Hiditas, 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

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:

Johm 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 Cosk, 2855 Bush St., Office Worker
Paul E. Costan, 125-30th, Phone Worker
William E. Edwards, 118 Garfield St., Cab Driver
David Ellison, 753-11th Ave., Apprentice Treatment Plant Operator
Michael L. Golden, 1301 Leavenworth, Ward Clerk
Eric Gooby, 755 Rhode Island St., Physician
Stephen C. Gonzalez, 248 Wheeler, Phone Worker
Katherine G. Ikeyami, 603 Kansas, Phone Worker
Alexander Larsen, 1586 Fell, Artist
Todd Notan, 225-14th, Proofreader
Charles S. Overbeck, 225-14th, 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. Welle, 5-27th St., Printer
Brian James Wilson, 3511-16th 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 Crum, 779 Vermont Dr., Chair Cable Car Awards
Mary C. Dunlap, 425 Staples Ave., Lawyer/Teacher
Eileen Gilis, 250 McClain St., Human Rights Commission Specialist
Romi Pauline Guy, 583 Missouri St., Administrator
Clare M. Harris, 3478-18th St., Photographer
Cleve Jones, 3955-17th St., Legislative Assistant
Leslie A. Manning, 15 Dehon St., Fund Raising Consultant
Bill Matsumoto, 470 Grove St., S.F. Personnel Clerk
Louise A. Mcminick, 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 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 Wolfd, 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. Featherstone, 78 Sanchez St., Retired
Joe Eliseo Graham, 2507 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. Hilaion, 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, 115 A Duboce St., Legal Asst./Secretary
Steven Sams, 1395 A 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. 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 J. Brown, 726 Lake St., Real Estate Broker
Leon Bruschera, 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. Conrardt, 631 O'Farrell St., Presbyterian Minister
Eleanor Rossi Cnindre, 1900 Gough St., Housewife
Carlootta 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 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, 51, 2130 Fulton St., Jesuit Priest Univ. San Francisco
Madeline Samarasz, 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.

Martin Eng can win!

The Sponsors for Martin Lee Eng are:

Ted Aksnes, 1382 Green St, Contractor
Vernon Barnes, 1332 California St., C.P.A.
Terrel L. Beckwith, 55 Vanderwater, Real Estate Executive
Melvin M. Bell, Sr., 2930 Broadway, Lawyer
Jackson Chang, 2202-17th Ave., Imports & Exports
Michael P. Christiansen, 1153 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 Molinar, 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
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

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. Burbine, 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 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 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 Trzuco, 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

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 Borvice, 234 Gates St., Administrator/Attorney at Law
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender
Agrupino R. Carbato, 60 Collins, Electrical Engineer/Vice Pres.
Lily Cuneo, 3819 Jackson St., War Memorial Board Trustee
Anne Belisle Daley, 795 Geary Blvd., Executive Direct. Victim Witness
Harold S. Dobbs, 1000 Mason St., Attorney
Jes T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Heights Blvd., Publisher
Michael Hennessey, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of S.F.
Stanley Herzeit, 1170 Sacramento St., Consultant
Donna J. Hitchens, 4176-20th St., Commission on the Status of Women
Jean Jacobs, 95 San Andreas Way, Delinquency Prevention
Walter G. Jebe, 314 Polaris Way, Pres. S.F. Public Library
Commission
Leroy King, 75 Tampa Lane, Regional Director, L.W.U.
Gordon J. Lau, 340-39th 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)
Sandra A. Ouye, 827-24th Ave., Housing Administrator
Rev. Edward L. Pea, 350 Abarro Drive, Clergy
Claire C. Pifer, 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. 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 Andrex, 286 Guerrero St., Health Administration
Carmencita L. Dela Cruz, 2783 Bryant St., Accountant
Larry L. McCrum, 3412-26th St., Bartender
Joseph A. Macallari, 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 Macallari, 969 Shotwell St., Housewife
Miguel Quiroz, 424 Pennsylvania Ave., Immigration Coordinator
Deter
Connie Rucker, 1146 Key Ave., Wife
Barry Wm. Showers, 977 Shotwell St., Roofer
Dotie A. Dinelli, 275 Girard, Secretary
Ana D. Bonilla, 537 Penttis, 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
Jaye 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 Keeper
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, 900 Bush, Phone Call Operator
Roger Wayne Pauporc, 1426 Haight St., Bartender
John Hess, 554 Broadway, Barber
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
Scherrer Rae Ahonens, 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. Blethen, 1400 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 Gunmet, 1237-4th Ave., Attorney
Philomena Higgs, 146 Fillmore, Filmmaker
Richard Jensen, 450 Jones
William H. Jones, 925 Hayes, Cab Driver
Marilyn Kalman, 1012 De Haro, Attorney
Vincent R. Latimer, 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. Schietman, 1301-20th St., Attorney
Peter M. Spear, 1138 Green, Gift Shop Worker
R. William Vega, 1261 Guererro, Cab Driver
J. Scott Weaver, 560 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 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 Bovince, 234 Gates, Attorney
Harry G. Brit, 5622-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Dorothy M. Casper, 870 Bush St., Property Manager
William K. Cathen, 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 Evankovich, 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, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff
James R. Herman, 635 Connecticut, President, ILWU
Anne Kronenberg, 1621 Waller St., P.U.C. Administrator
Cary Trye, 3382 Clay St., Public Affairs Consultant
Stephanie Mischak, 1851-8th Ave., Board Member,
Nat'l Women's Political Caucus
John L. Kolinari, 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. Ouyee, 827-24th Ave., Director, Kimochi Senior Services
Bob Ross, 4200-20th St., Publisher, Bay Area Reporter
Janet R. Weintraub, 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, 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 Finnegan, 1798 Bush, House wife
Peter L. Forsland, 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, 3382 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 Sapir, 66 Soledo Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Thomas C. Scanlon, 631 Vicente St., Retired Treasurer
Virginia L. Shea, 1563-38th Ave., Retired
Paul Shin, 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 Vonderwinkler, 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

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
- Mebane F. Croom, 1515 Gough St., Property Clerk
- Lawrence E. Dunn, 835 Cole St., Machinist Specialist
- Jim Dennis, 700 Goettinger, Photographer
- Shukri E. Dudaq, 2497 Funston Ave., Retired
- Wendell Fitzgerald, 144 Locke St., Production Manager
- Florence Fried, 271-19th Ave., Retired
- Morton Garfield, M.D., 85 Clary Court
- Alanna Hartzok, 299 Cheneys, Education Director
- David H. Hill, 3319 Clay St., Engineer
- James A. Himaburski, 3577 Market St., Professor
- Patricia A. Hollingsworth, 3025 Van Ness, Claims Operations Assistant
- Lorri K. Igingak, 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. Sakouneit, 68 Allston Way, Grocer-Owner
- Mark E. Schwier, 320 Turk St., Research Assistant
- E. R. Serofini, 4301-20th St., Teacher
- Helen Hale Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, Teacher
- Hiram Smith, 345 Montecito, Director-Legal Services Program
- Leon E. Smith, 1392 Golden Gate, Business Representative
- Mario V. Vega, 50 Paulding, Gardener
- Elmer Wilhelms, 277-B Shipley St., Buyer, Endup
- John J. Wilson, 901 Lake St., Artist
- George K. Woot, 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, 1723-7th Ave., Disabled
- James M. Carter, Jr., 3751-20th St., Social Worker
- Philip Curato, 1436 Waller St., Musician
- Lorell L. Duncan, 480 Eddy St., Salesperson
- Lynn Cline Forrest, 40 Langton St., Accountant
- Paula "Rain" Laguna, 2207-20th Ave., Artist
- Andrew A. Lives, 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, 2207-30th Ave., Painter
- Marie Sooklar, 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 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:

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:

Robert Squeri

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

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, 2726 Missouri, Store Owner
Jean Ishibashi, 1363 Alabama, Community Organizer
Jeff Jones, 500 Francenin, 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, 2015 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 Emiet Cl., 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

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, 2990-22nd 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 Ellis, Senior Citizen Program Director
Joseph M. Hannan, 68½ 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. Latino, 191 Los Palamos, Ret. SFPD, Past CMDR
VFW Post 4103
Alpert Park Li, 146 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 Hyle, 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, 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 Zimacona, 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 Jaicks, 62 Wooland Ave., County Party Chair
Liam P. Lee, 1036 Pacific, U.S. Postmaster Retired
Pius Lee, 699 Marina Blvd., Real Estate
Agrupinto 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. 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 L.L.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. Del, 1521 Larkin St., Attorney
Yoritada 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 Mezey, 3382 Clay Street, Attorney
Jim Gonzales, 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, 250 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 Shadr, Planning Commissioner
Al Borvice, 234 Gates St., Attorney
Leon Bruschera, 557-10th Ave., Firefighter
Ina Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Home Executive
Douglas Engmann, 408 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 Honig, 50 Lopez Ave., Business Person
Anne Kronberg, 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 Pachtner, 155 Vicksburg St., Consumer Advocate
Gina Pennestrini, 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. Birt, 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 Hennessy, 1490 Dolores, Sheriff of San Francisco
Henry E. Berman, 483 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. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hghts 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 Jaacks, 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
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritis, 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
Moritmer 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
Lonnie Green, 739-27th St., Writer
Herbert Holmgren, 2040 Franklin St., Retired
James Earl Jewell, 749 Rhode Island, Lighting Designer
Paul F. Lorch, 1034 Guerero 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.
Ramsay B. Navarrete, 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, 580 Hill St., Government Attorney
Gayle Prince, 1980 Scott St., Small Business Owner
Charles B. Renfew, 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.

The Sponsors for Rosario Anaya are:
Lucille Abramson, 29 West Clay Park, Volunteer
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assembleman
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
Agrino P. Cerbatos, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
Janet Chambers MD, 82 Peralta Ave., Prof. Obstetrics Gynecology
Judy Dellemonica, 3232 Taraval, President SF Classroom Teachers
Assoc.
Jess T. Esteva, 5285 Diamond Hts. Blvd., Publisher
Ladde Farfan, 1322 Funston, Chair. Comm. Advis. Comt. Special Education
Dianne Feinstein, 2030 Lyon St., Mayor
Robert E. Gonzalez, 361 Pennsylvania, Attorney
Zuretti L. Gosby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Betty Lin Guimaraes, 780-81th Ave., Program Manager
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Dolmar 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, 3382 Clay St. Lawyer
John L. Molinari, 1322 Chestnut, Member Board of Supervisors
Alfred J. Nelder, 150 Cazitas Ave., Former Police Chief
Michael D. Nolan, 156 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.
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.

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, 3744 Mission, Retired
Robert Silvestri, 3090-23rd Ave., County Central Committeeman
Catherine T. McCarthy, 95 Park St., Retired
Virginia Creighton, 550 Arbulo Dr., College Business Professor
Mohamed Noir Taqui-Eddin, 1390-29th Ave., Grocer
Nidal Nazal, 7 Locksley Ave., Chief Financial Officer
Julius Giorgi, 746 Monterey Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Thomas Hanratty, 38 Mizpah Ave., Muni Railway Supervisor
James M. Jungkuth, 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 K. Mooser, 1762-17th Ave., Bookkeeper
Peter J. Gutierrez, 650 Edinburgh St., Veterans 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, 3744 Mission St., Assistant Broker
Ramon F. Navarro, 2107 Almendy Blvd., Real Estate Broker
Paul P. McGinty, 415 Collingwood St., Investor
William J. Young, 85 Richland Ave., Retired
Margie Osuna, 3744 Mission St., Student
Evelyn Pethit, 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, 1000 Gough St., Housewife
Paul S. Hungerford, 1511-35th Ave., Retired School Administrator
Julius Jelinski, 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. Kerghof, 2929-25th Ave., Mathematician
Ruth L. Clark, 2630-21st Ave., Senior Insurance Underwriter
Olive Horner, 2344-17th Ave., Insurance Agency Office Manager
Gloria T. Barrojo, 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, 2254-40th Ave., Jet Engine Mechanic
Chris J. Pallis, 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. Tressman, 1834-26th Ave., Advertising
Pat E. Weidy, 680 Sutter St., Computer Operator
David R. Zusko, 2351-41st Ave., Pharmacist
Anita A. Flori, 1479-34th Ave., Computer Operator
Johnnie Ordean Espland, 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, 322-16th St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeff Brown, 850-40th Ave., Public Defender, City & County of S.F.
Agritino Cerbatas, 60 Collins St., Electrical Engineer
William K. Cohlenitz, 10-5th Ave., Attorney
Jo Daly, 123 Topaz Way, Police Commissioner
Carlotta Texidor DePortillo, 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 Feinestein, 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 Hsich, 4 Cortez St., Architect
Margel Kauffman, 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. Molnari, 1322 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Jeffrey Ken Mori, 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 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 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
Erie Garris, 44 Prospect Ave., Marijuana/Anti-Tax Activist
Robert A. DuPrato, 374 Laidley, Physician
Mark R. Pickens, 1464-48th Ave., Anti-Draft/Anti-Tax Activist
Bennie Hoy, 340 Hayes St., Abortion Rights Activist
Justin Raimondo, 1060 Pine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 351 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, 1300 Bush St., Vice-Squad Abolitionist
Cathie Ellen Heinrich, 1506-8th Ave., Pension Administrator
Richard Haas, Jr., 677 Oak St., Process Server
Laura M. Krouth, 1952 Divisadero, Purchasing Agent
Bevorly 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 Mueller, 1952 Divisadero, Proofreader
Francis S. Goeltz, 130 Clifford Terrace, Airline Pilot
Ira W. Carter, 1335-38th Ave., Comm Mail Receiving Agent
Caruth 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
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 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 Shotle 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, 171 Jones, School Board Member
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shadiner, 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. Gloyd, 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, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1539 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Jane McKaskle Murphy, 2253 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
Elaine Westbrook, 152 Maddux Ave., Director Patient Advocacy
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliris, 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. Bourgat, 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
Walker G. Jabe, 314 Polaris Way, President, Library Commission
Henry Jefferson, 27 Wilmar, 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
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. Terhuyden, 61 Toledo Way, Attorney
Dorothy Vukovich, 177 San Pablo 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
Ellie Brown, 1532 Shafter, Director Hunters Point Neighborhood Facility
Dorothy Casper, 1173 Bush Street, Homemaker
Agrino R. Cespedes, 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 Gooby, 299 Maywood Dr., Dentist
Anne W. Halsted, 1308 Montgomery, Business Person
Lilardo Hernandez, 40 Harper, Director of City Agency
Dr. Eugene Hopp, 33 Heatherview, 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. Longwen, 125 Santa Ana, Real Estate
Esther Marks, 125 Upper Terrace, Volunteer
Peter Mezey, 332 Clay Street, Lawyer
Deborah J. Petrie, 1150 Kearney, Planner
Isadore Pivnick, 2290 Stockton, School Administrator, Retired
Nina Raymedo, 706 Faxon Ave., Nurse/Director Filipino Center
Terence A. Redmond, 342-5th Ave., Attorney
John F. Rothmann, 629 Arguello, Consultant
Edmundo Sandoval, 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

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, 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, 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, 712 Portola Dr., College Teacher
Peter M. Finnegam, 355 Post Street, Member, Board of Governors, Calif. Community College
JoAnn Hendricks, 2380-31st 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 Juicils, 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. Ouy, 827-24th Ave., Administrator
John Riordan, 426 Willow, Lawyer
Thelem Shelley, 70 Eversen Street, Assistant Director
Arlo Smith, 66 San Fernando Way, District Attorney
Hiram E. Smith, 343 Montecillo, 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 Filbert St., Civil Liberties Attorney
Dennis Pera, 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 Raimond, 1060 Fine St., Gay Activist
Michael E. Mayakis, 315 Holloway Ave., Community Switchboard President
Mark P. 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 Has, Jr., 677 Oak, Process Server
Ronald W. Dorsey, 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, 214-4th 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 Gulin, 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 Borve, 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
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 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
Agar Jails, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Weinstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lambert, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milan F. Reitman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomata N. Scott, 191½ Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Ari Haile 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, 2152-42nd Ave., Parliamentarian
Timothy R. Wolfred, 91 Sanchez St., Member Community College Board
Harold T. Yee, 1280 Ellis Street, Economist/President Asian Inc.

---

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 Borve, 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
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 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
Agar Jails, 62 Woodland Ave., S.F. Party County Chair
Edith Weinstein Jenkins, 456 Belvedere St., Retired College Professor
Margel Kaufman, 3036-20th Ave., Educator/Parent
Albert V. Lambert, 610-5th Ave., Union Official
Phyllis Lyon, 651 Duncan St., Educator
Enola D. Maxwell, 1559 Jerrold Ave., Executive Director
Milan F. Reitman, 30 West Clay Park, Labor Negotiator
Thomata N. Scott, 191½ Broderick Street, Intake and Referral Specialist
Thelma Shelley, 70 Everson Street, Facilities Management
Ari Haile 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, 2152-42nd 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.

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. Derevenscenzo, 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 Madachi, 1388-39th 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
Helena G. Kaery, 765-30th Ave., Clerk Typist
Barbara A. Proctor, 1216 Taylor, Sales
Jan B. Cacia, 1216 Taylor St., Sales
Juan P. Merpil, 314 Kearny, Health Worker
Susan Rogers, 1660 Sacramento St., Secretary
Mary Pat Cedor, 1567-44th Ave., Storekeeper
Marilynn Sperber, 2865 Chestnut St., Eligibility Worker
Richard J. Trevor, 2423-41st Ave., Medical Records Technician
Philip Gumon, 4118 Moraga St., Receptionist
Patricia J. Derevenscenzo, 3024 Laguna St., Accounting Secretary
Elizabeth Liu, 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 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:
Art Agnos, 637 Connecticut, Assemblyman
Quentin Kopp, 68 Country Club Dr., President, Board of Supervisors
John L. Molinar, 1328 Chestnut, Member, Board of Supervisors
Louise H. Renne, 3725 Jackson St., Member, Board of Supervisors
Carol Ruth Silver, 62 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. Bonchetta, 10 Claves Way, Self-employed
Bob Bustamante, 1400 Castro St., Employment Specialist
William K. Cobleitz, 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 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, 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, 10 Mocada Way, Security Administrator
A. Cecil Williams, 60 Hiliritas, Minister

The Sponsors for Sal Rosselli 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 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 L. Callanan, 1651 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, 633 Connecticut St., International President, ILWU
Ruth S. Kadish, 145 Delmar St., Airports Commissioner
Richard M. Kaplan, 2944 Jackson St., Attorney
Fothsford Kilt, 2901 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. 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.
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 Yehall Chin, 3146 Lyon St., Educator and Bank Manager
Zuretti L. Goosby, 259 Maywood Drive, Dentist
John Michael Hennessy, 1490 Dolores St., Sheriff of San Francisco
Aileen C. Hernandez, 820-47th Ave., Urban Consultant
Richard D. Hongo, 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. Molinar, 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, 60 Hillhurst St., Minister Glide Church
Timothy R. Wofred, 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!

快！有什麼好方法是樂趣的、幫助鄰居，同時可以增加收入？
回答：在投票日工作！在那裡報到。

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. Ayúdenla una solidaria en la
También en los lugares de votación el día de
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 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, 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
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 faithness.

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 COMMITTEE MEN 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” APPOINTEES 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 $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 $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 $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:


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 will 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.
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.

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
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.
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.
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

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

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 will 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
Marvin A. Fellhauer
Camille F. Reed
James V. Ahern
Ernest and Barbara Munoz
Louis and Violet Sozzi
Maxine and Walter Crombie
David and Carol Mullin
Alystus J. Smyth
Joan Willenau
Raymond and Clare White
Rene and Emelyn Codis
Harry Soden
Henry J. ratio
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 Farstein
John and Madeline Sheerin
William and Irene Keating
Joseph and Agnes Mibach
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 Carli
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 Garbaldi
Helen Vargas
Frank Linney
Laura Moffitt
John Oliva
Bernie Oliva
Silvio and Eileen Cavellini

Robert Galusha
Kenneth Payeh
Ann Gary
Cheryl Marel
Frank Naccarato
Ruth Passen
Erola Maxwell
Hal Craney
Walter G. Jee
Miriam Steinbeck
Gerold Gallagher
John Thompson
Frank Luebello
Veronica Murray
Helen Nengnig
Frances Coddon
Frances and Rudy Hallberg
Helen and Clarence Rosenstock
William and Ethel Best
Walter and Kathleen Glynn
Walter and Fern Freeling
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 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)

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.”

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 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 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 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 costs approximately $30,000 to successfully train a officer. The failure of this city to retain these officers will cost the city a lot more than the new retirement 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 Committeeeman)

Democratic Committeeeman Arlo Hale Smith
Republican Committeeeman 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

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
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:

<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 Bovice
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

Eualio Fransto
Corinne Frugoni
Richard Gaikowski
Golden Gate Alliance
Dan Goldstein
Dr. Zuretti Goosby
Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council
Vincent Hallinan
Sue Hestor
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 Shuch

Sierra Club, San Francisco Group
Supervisor Carol Ruth Silver
Regina Sned
South of Market Alliance
Charles Starkbuck 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 Wylund

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. 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
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 City last year:

Utility Users Taxes $15,887,456
Property Taxes $5,612,385
Franchise Taxes $2,436,841
Payroll Taxes $3,170,346

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’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 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 Hsielh
San Franciscans for Responsible Energy Policies
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 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, 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.
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 Bustamente, Coalition of Hispanics for Employment Services
Walter Park, Independent Housing Services
Rev. Dr. Norman Lechem, Mayor’s Council on Disabilities Concerns
Jerry Klein, Hospital Workers, Local 250
Noami Sohn
Westla Whitfield
Lucille Lockhart
Edwin S. Sarisfield, General Manager, San Francisco Department of Social Services
Julie Kavanaugh
Cindy Kolb, Director, Disabled Student Services, SFSU
Gay Blackford, National Association for Visually Handicapped
Pam Goodlaws
Mollie & Sam Gold
Joan Dillon, Immediate Past-President, SEIU Local 400
Sodonia Wilson, Educator
Jack Trujillo
Jane McKenzie Murphy
Kathleen Lammers, 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 Motnari
Supervisor Willie B. Kennedy
Supervisor Harry Briti
Susan Bieman, Planning Commissioner
Susan Ruberg

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
Madelyn Samarzes, Business Representative
Teamsters Local 856
John Estes, President
Teamsters Local 85
Robert McDonnell, Business Representative
Laborers Local 261
Mike Hardenan, 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 Separtis
David Finn
Sylvia Durranne
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
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
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
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

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.

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-

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. Petracakis, 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.
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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 doctors, health professionals, and neighbors:

Laura Bock
Dr. Robert Brigante
Dr. Kenneth Brown
Dr. Francis Chamberlain
Dr. Joan Cucek
Milo 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
Grainger Hill

Ellen Huppert
Dr. Lester Jacobson
Paul Johnson
Jackie Lalanne
Dr. Jennifer LaVail
Dr. Matthew LaVail
Margaret Northcutt
Kenny O’Hara
Alvin Pelavin
Marion Robertson
Burton Rockwell
Nicky Salam
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.
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 commissioner 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 commissioner 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 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, or 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 one 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 reconstruc-
tion 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.
TEXT OF PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT
PROPOSITION D
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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 thereof subsequently 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
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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 8.553-14 and 8.554-14, 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
(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>1.0350</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
(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 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 credited 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 to 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 credited 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 allowance 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 1 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 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 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, so far 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)

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" 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 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 his own convenience. 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 requirements 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 re-
sulting 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 sys-
tem. 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 pay-
ment 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 in-
terest credited thereon, shall be refunded to him sub-
ject to the conditions prescribed by the board of
supervisors to govern similar terminations of em-
ployment of other members of the retirement system.
If he shall again become a member of the depart-
ment, 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 depart-
ment 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, ac-

8.590-10 Computation of Service

The following time shall be included in the com-
putation 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 enti-
tled 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 speci-
died in 8.590-14.
(3) Time during which said member is absent from
a status included in paragraph (1), by reason of ser-
vice 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 fol-
lowing 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
an amount 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 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 ret-
irement 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 provid-
ed in section 8.590-8, 8.590-9 and 8.590-10.
(2) The city and county shall contribute to the re-
tirement system such amounts as may be necessary,
when added to the contributions referred to in para-
graph (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 expe-
rience 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 in-
terest thereon, then held by said system to provide
said benefits on account of service rendered by re-
spective 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 ac-
tuary, who shall take into account the interest which
shall be earned on said contributions, the compensa-
tion 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
(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 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
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 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 38.949 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 parallel along the 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...
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.
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 affidavit 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:
ENVÍE LA BALOTA A:
請將選票寄給本人下址:

___________________________________________________________
Zip Code

___________________________________________________________
Area Postal

DATE: ____________________________
FECHA: ____________________________
日期

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

4. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT IN FULL
FIRMA COMPLETA DEL SOLICITANTE
申請人簽名

IF YOU HAVE MOVED
Complete this section if you have moved and now reside at an address other than that
shown on your affidavit of registration.

I moved on ____________________________
My residence address is ____________________________

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

SI USTED SE HA CAMBIADO
Complete esta sección si usted se ha cambiado y
reside ahora en otra dirección distinta a la que
aparece en su declaración jurada de registro.

Me cambié el ____________________________ de 19
Mi dirección es ____________________________

NOTA: Un votante que se 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 registro antes
de la fecha final para registrarse de esta
elección no puede votar.

MAIL TO:
ENVIAR A:

ABSENT VOTING SECTION
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS OFFICE
ROOM 155, CITY HALL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED IN
REGISTRAR’S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, October 25,
7 DAYS BEFORE ELECTION DAY.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

LA SOLICITUD DEBE RECIBIRSE EN LA OFICINA
DEL REGISTRAR ANTES DE LAS 5:00 EN PUNTO
EL SEPTIMO DIA ANTERIOR AL DIA DE LA
ELECCION.

申請缺席選票必須在選舉日七日之前
即11月25日星期二下午五時經由
選民名冊官辦事處收到此申請表格。
Your ballot corresponds to "Yes" or "No". This number will appear on
the left or right side of the page. Please look for your number and write
the name and number of your choice on this coupon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF APPLICABLE: This office may not appear on all ballot styles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY:

0000

TELL ME YOUR HOME ADDRESS:

MAILING ADDRESS:

CARRIER ROUTE PRESORT

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4691

155 CITY HALL
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

JAY PATTERSON